

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
102ND YEAR

APRIL, 1938

APR 22 1938

No. 405

THE
DUBLIN
REVIEW

A QUARTERLY AND CRITICAL JOURNAL

This issue includes

Church of England Doctrine

BY FR. VINCENT McNABB, O.P., and MGR. RONALD A. KNOX

Leo XIII

BY REV. PHILIP HUGHES

The City of God

BY ALGERNON CECIL

The American Church Today

BY DONALD ATTWATER

LONDON

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE LTD.

Price 3s. 6d. or \$1 net. Yearly Subscription, 15s. or \$4 Post Free.

Registered at the Post Office, Chicago, as Second-Class Matter.

COMMUNICATIONS in regard to articles and all books for review, as well as all communications respecting the Publishing Department, should be addressed to BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 43, 44, 45 Newgate Street, London, E.C.1. Advertisements should reach the Publishers not later than the 10th of the last month of each Quarter.

No MSS. can be returned unless accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes. Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published on or about the 1st of January, April, July, and October.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN,
AT THE ANCHOR
PRESS, Tiptree,
22 Essex

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

April, May, June,
1938

Associate Editors :
DENIS GWYNN
LORD CLONMORE

LONDON
BURNS OATES AND
WASHBOURNE LTD.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

FR. VINCENT McNABB, O.P., *has for years laboured for reconciliation between the Christian Churches and has recently published a volume of essays entitled "The Church and Reunion"*.

MGR. RONALD KNOX *was a protagonist in many controversies as an Anglican chaplain in Oxford before he became a Catholic in 1917.*

DONALD ATTWATER, *well known as a Catholic encyclopaedist and former editor of the "Catholic Herald", has recently returned from a lecturing tour in the U.S.A.*

REV. PHILIP HUGHES *has achieved a great reputation as an ecclesiastical historian and is Archivist to the Westminster Archdiocese.*

C. F. MELVILLE *was for some years a special correspondent in Vienna.*

WILLIAM L. SCOTT, K.C., *has been President of the Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa for fifteen years.*

DOUGLAS V. DUFF *commanded the Palestine Police Force in Jerusalem for some years after the war and has written several notable books on recent events in Palestine.*

ALGERNON CECIL, *one of the most distinguished of recent converts, is a brilliant philosopher and historian.*

PROFESSOR WILLIAM C. ATKINSON, *of Glasgow University, was an official guest at the recent celebrations at Portugal's famous university.*

REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J., *is probably the most widely travelled and best known of the English Jesuits.*

MRS. GERTRUDE DONALD *is a recent convert of the Church and has published an important volume of studies on the personalities of the Oxford Movement.*

CONTENTS

APRIL, MAY, JUNE,

1938

	PAGE
Doctrine in the Church of England By Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P.	187
The Report on Doctrine By Rt. Rev. Mgr. Ronald A. Knox	201
To a Blackthorn Tree (Poem) By J. Macleod	215
Austria at the Cross Roads By C. F. Melville	216
Terror in Outremer By Douglas V. Duff	233
Gargoyles (Poem) By Gerald Crow	248
Leo XIII By Rev. Philip Hughes	249
Urbs et Orbs By Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.	258
The University of Coimbra By Professor William C. Atkinson	268
The Catholic Ukrainian-Canadians By William L. Scott, K.C.	281
The Spoilt Convert By Gertrude Donald	291
The American Church Today By Donald Attwater	321
The City of God and the Commonwealth of God By Algernon Cecil	336
The Wood (Poem) By Egerton Clarke	353

Some Recent Books - - - - -	354
-----------------------------	-----

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS, AND THE PRIESTHOOD; THE DESTINY OF MAN; ST. BENEDICT; SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO; JOHN WESLEY IN THE EVOLUTION OF PROTESTANTISM; THE EARLY STUARTS 1603-1660; TOWARDS THE TWENTIETH CENTURY; MEN AND TENDENCIES; JONATHAN SWIFT; THE MUSE IN CHAINS; THE PLACE OF SAINT THOMAS MORE IN ENGLISH LITERATURE AND HISTORY; THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH; THE CHURCH AND REUNION; SOME ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX THOUGHT; THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN MODERN SCOTLAND; THE EARLY DOMINICANS; A SAINT UNDER MOSLEM RULE; THE DIARY OF A COUNTRY PRIEST; IN PARENTHESIS; HALF A LIFE LEFT; SONS OF THE EAGLE; LOST ATLANTIS; CORRESPONDENT IN SPAIN; IN FRANCO'S SPAIN; THE LETTERS OF TSAR NICHOLAS AND EMPRESS MARIE; WORK AND PROPERTY; AN INTRODUCTION TO SYMBOLIC LOGIC; LA MARILOGIE DE SAINT JEAN DAMASCÈNE; ORBIS CATHOLICUS; THE CATHOLIC DOCTOR; REALIZATION; THE HERNE'S EGG; ALCAZAR; THE SILVER BRANCH; INTERCESSIONS; ISLE OF DESTINY.

SANDS

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

By the Very Rev. Fr. HUGH POPE, O.P., S.T.M., D.S.S.

"There could hardly be a better introduction to St. Augustine than the present work."—*Tablet*.

Demy 8vo

428 pp.

12s. 6d. net

MODERN SACRED ART

Edited by JOAN MORRIS, S.P.

Illustrations of Modern Sacred Art in most European Countries with special articles on the Philosophy of Art of interest to the Artist, Critic, and the plain Man.

11½ × 8½ ins.

160 pp.

7s. 6d. net

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF EASTERN LITURGIES

By PÈRE SALAVILLE, A.A.

Adapted from the French by

Very Rev. Mgr. JOHN M. T. BARTON, D.D.

Formerly Prof. of Holy Scripture, Hebrew and Liturgy, St. Edmund's College, Ware; Vice-Chairman Society of St. John Chrysostom.

Crown 8vo

7s. 6d. net

MARIA DE LA LUZ

Protomartyr of Catholic Action

By ANTHONY DRAGON, S.J.

The story of a young girl who suffered and died in the cause of Christ in Mexico.

Large Cr.

5s. net

15 KING ST., COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2

The Dublin Review

APRIL, 1938

No. 405

DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

(Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922.)

THE state of religious tension within the Church of England which led to this historical Report is well-summarized by one of the most loyal and competent of her recent historians. In his valuable life of *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*, the Bishop of Chichester, Dr. G. K. A. Bell, writes :

One of the most important questions before the Church during Dr. Davidson's primacy was the question of unity in belief.

There were many points of doctrine on which members of the Church of England were sharply divided. There was also a considerable controversy, more vehement at some times than others, regarding the essentials of the Christian faith.

The disputes between Anglo-Catholics were hardly edifying. But the conflict, often bitter, between Modernists and Conservatives, was of a much more disturbing character.

It was bad for the internal life of the Church of England. It was not less harmful for the efforts which the Church of England was making for a rapprochement with other Christian communities.

Ought not such a Church, it was not unnaturally urged, to take special pains to know its own mind, and to be at unity within itself ? [P. 1134.]

Two letters, amongst countless others may supplement this outline by Dr. Davidson's biographer. The first letter is from a letter of Arthur Balfour to Dr. Davidson when the Enabling Bill was first mooted.

Jan. 19, 1914.

... The English Church has been from the start a comprehensive Body; and this great merit was attained at the beginning by compromise; and amid all the changes of centuries, the original marks of the compromise have never been obliterated. [Ibid. P. 958.]

A letter of Bishop Gore throws such light on the almost undecipherable character of the man and, for us Catholics, the almost unintelligible religious outlook of him and those of his communion that it must be given. The letter was written after a session of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation to which the English Church Union had sent a petition asking for authoritative condemnation of modernist doctrines. To this petition the Archbishop had made an official reply which moved Bishop Gore to write the following letter :

Feb. 17, 1922.

I feel constrained to tell you that your speech in Convocation in reference to the English Church Union petition, etc., is to some of us a grievous affliction. I venture to say that this sort of chaff, or apparently light-hearted disparagement of the gravity of the situation, tends to drive us wild. It is not a wise way of dealing with us.

I did not sign the petition, because I thought it was perhaps improper for a former member of the House, who might still have been a member if he had willed, to present petitions to it.

Also I want to concentrate on the work of *presenting the truth independently of authority or ecclesiastical reference*. [Sic.]

But I feel as if your speech had made it impossible.

I am at a loss to understand what you mean. Has not this Modernist Group in fact shown its hand? You wish to try and persuade me that their position (as Sanday assured us) only touched facts (miracles) and not doctrines.

Now it is plain that the most fundamental doctrines of the faith of St. Paul, and St. John and the Church are being repudiated from somewhat different points of view by Major, Rashdall and others. It appears to me that if under these circumstances the Bishops do not at the least rebuke them by a solemn affirmation of the basis on which the Church of England stands and the message which the ministers of the Church are commissioned to deliver, it will have assented to the idea that Major and Rashdall's teaching is legitimate—a *school of thought* within the Church of England.

They are heresiarchs; and very fundamentally so, and very dangerous. So I think.

I don't know what to do. But I think something must be done to make the Bishops alive to the situation. I never felt *official optimism* so sickening.

.

Catholic students of the psychology of religious belief would probably find that this heart-burning letter of one of the most intellectual of modern Anglicans was a psychological specimen of supreme interest. Of mere human respect, Bishop Gore seems to have had none. Of human ambitions he seems equally to have had none. Of outward signs betokening rebellion against God's will he had none that those of us who knew him, could discover. Yet in matters of supernatural faith, which are essentially matters of external, visible, audible authority, he wished to "present truth independently of authority or ecclesiastical reference". A mind so unattached as that of Bishop Gore might have been taken, and, indeed, was often so taken, to sympathize with any similarly unattached mind, and with any of the conclusions reached by such a mind in its unattachment. The problem for a psychologist of religious experience is this: how could such an anti-authoritarian and therefore heresiarchical mind feel sickened at "heresiarchs" like Major and Rashdall? We leave the problem stated but unsolved.

Bishop Gore and many of the High-Church were one with the Evangelicals in looking upon the Modernism of the modernists as an uprooting of the fundamentals of faith. But within the comprehensiveness of the Church of England their only official action against this uprooting was the somewhat weakening reaffirmations of the faith. Amongst the younger men who followed, as they thought, Bishop Gore's spirit rather than his programme these weakening affirmations against doctrinal opponents seemed so barren that they suggested an official and prolonged conference with these opponents in the hope of finding fundamental agreement. From the first the men who mooted the Conference saw that to be effective it must be prolonged. Their forecast of its duration for from ten to twenty years has been strangely justified by the fifteen years of its actual duration.

Conferences and joint statements had been not infrequent within their Church. But these statements had been usually made by one school of thought; and these Conferences, even when between different schools of thought, had never been official. In spite of

these party reports and unofficial peace-seeking conferences, no one within or without the Church of England could say authoritatively "what it stood for" in fundamental matters of faith. If after a prolonged official conference between representatives of the various theological schools of thought, and without the interference of the State an agreed programme of religious belief could be published, it was felt that the Church of England might take up a definite position and action equal to its opportunities.

The following letter of Archbishop Davidson to the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Burge) gave being to the Conference :

In continuance of my letter of September 8th and of your subsequent letter of November 29th, I write you on behalf of the Archbishop of York and myself to say that it is our wish to nominate those whose names I append hereto to act as a Commission with the following reference :

To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to determining the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences.

We note and approve your proposal that the Report of the Commission should not be an authoritative statement, but that it should when prepared be laid before the Bishops for them to consider what further action (if any) should be taken.

For a Catholic who has inherited the simple definite teaching of the Creed and Councils, it is hard to understand the state of religious belief that occasioned or authorized such a commission. Our conception of the Church as the pillar and ground of truth means that what the Church has settled as true cannot be denied, except by those who by their denial have placed themselves outside the Church. The first eight General Councils—almost wholly Eastern—have promulgated the fundamental doctrines of God and of the Incarnate God with such authority that denial is a voluntary going out from the visible unity of the Church. But a national Church reorganized largely if not mainly in

Doctrine in the Church of England 191

the interest of the nation's Sovereign, and with that Sovereign as the Supreme Head or Supreme Governor, was not likely to take the traditional religious view of religious authority. As unity is the most essential quality of being, the Church of England must be kept in being by a vigorous effort to keep its unity.

The archbishops had been asked to nominate their Commission mostly from young men. Amongst the young men Dr. Temple, Bishop of Manchester (now Archbishop of York) brought something more than hopefulness to the Commission. Almost against the desires of the English Episcopate his Life and Liberty Movement had persuaded Parliament to pass the Enabling Bill, giving the Church Assembly a promise of spiritual autonomy unknown and undreamt of since Elizabeth. There was much to say, and much was said, for the hope that if an agreement on dogmatic fundamentals could be reached by the dogmatic experts who were not extremists, the State Church would be allowed by the State to express itself dogmatically. To lovers of the Church of England and above all to the many lovers of England who looked on the Church as England expressing itself religiously the Commission was as romantic as the Great War; which ended successfully only when a military United Front reached unity of control.

.

The men who were chosen to sit on the Commission were chosen confessedly because they were not what is called "extremists". But as we have known the epithet extremist applied to one who denied that "A is or is not", it was a little uncertain what ideological opinion, if any, would be dominant in the Commission. I think we are within the truth when we say that the tone of thought, if not the school of thought, most prevalent amongst this group of non-extremists was Modernism. We are supported in this seemingly contradictory statement by a frank avowal of Dr. Major in answer to Professor Goudge. Dr. Major writes, "It is gratifying that Dr. Goudge when naming the parties in the Church of England does not include the Modernist Party.

"Modernists are widely distributed in all three parties (Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, and Central.)"*

Perhaps the most symbolical representative of this modernistic tone prevalent in the Commission was the late Canon B. H. Streeter. His most acute analytical mind recalled those high-power microscopes that magnify coloured objects so much that their colour disappears.

Fifteen years of conference are embedded in the book of some two hundred and fifty pages. A charming page due to the pen of Dr. Temple in his "Chairman's Introduction" points to the romance—and perhaps the tragedy—of the Commission :

We escaped early from that false responsibility which exists in a sense that a man *represents* some section of ecclesiastical opinion. We were drawn from most of the existing *schools of thought* in the Church and had our own several apprehensions as it is in Jesus Christ ; but our minds moved freely, and at times playfully, in the intercourse of friends, and each both learnt and taught as our work advanced.

Behind the friendship and the laughter were the steady purpose to pursue the truth, and the common devotions in the Chapels of the Colleges where we met. Each morning the chairman celebrated the Holy Communion and the daily offices were duly said. In our prayer together and in our communions we found the direction for our common effort.

The memory of our meetings is associated in my mind with the description of the mingled devotion and hilarity of the *Holy Party*, which Scott Holland gives in his charming geographical sketch of Francis Paget—*Bundle of Memories*. [Introduction. Pp. 1, 2.]

It is to the credit of the common run of men that, if unmolested by mere partisans they will allow no differences of scientific political or religious feeling to prevent their living peacefully with their fellow-men. But the very condition of this fellowship is a recognition of their fellow-man's right to his scientific, political or scientific religious opinion. In other words social fellowship can be carried on without political or religious agreement and fellowship. But as social fellowship could not be carried

* *Church Times*, Feb. 11, p. 40.

on without agreement on social principles, so, likewise, scientific political and religious fellowship cannot be carried on without agreement on political and religious principles. Now there is a page of Dr. Temple's Introduction which, in spite of its almost disarming courteousness, shows us that fifteen years of social fellowship between a group of cultured English gentlemen ended, as it had begun, by their "recognizing" rather than resolving their fundamental differences on fundamental Christian doctrines. He writes :

In view of my own responsibility in the Church I think it right here to affirm that I whole-heartedly accept as historical facts the birth of our Lord from a virgin mother and the resurrection of His physical body from death and the tomb. . . . But I fully recognize the position of those who sincerely affirm the reality of our Lord's Incarnation without accepting one or both these two events as actually historical occurrences ; regarding the records as parables rather than as history. [P. 12.]

Those of us who have realized the efforts made by the teaching Church to remove all verbal ambiguities, will feel how undeniably Dr. Temple's official position has led him or has not prevented him from being led into a serious ambiguity. In the context of his considered Archiepiscopal statements the words "I fully recognize" may have at least three meanings. First they may mean : "I fully understand the meaning of the statement. As for instance, X says, two and two are six. I fully recognize what he means. But I disagree." Secondly, they may mean : "I know that X holds that two and two are six." Thirdly, they may mean : "As a member of a Society, indeed as an official of that Society I (recognize) accept him as a loyal member of that Society. He holds that two and two make six, though I personally hold that two and two make four. No manager of the Bank of England, however, would fully recognize him as a loyal member of the bank staff."

As members of a Church, which we recognize as a Church only because it is a teaching Church we may be excused from passing any judgement upon sincere Christians like Dr. Temple, who "fully recognize" that other

sincere men who are Arians or Nestorians are loyal members of the Church of England.

The group of young men, non-extremists, who spent fifteen years in preparing the Report must have worked with the wonted speed of youth. This may seem a paradox to those who have not studied the Index of the Report which we venture to present to our readers only in its main headings :

INTRODUCTION.

PROLEGOMENA : SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

- A. SCRIPTURE.
- B. CHURCH.
- C. ANGLICAN FORMULARIES.

PART I.

DOCTRINES OF GOD, AND REDEMPTION.

- A. GOD AND THE WORLD.
- B. SIN.
- C. REDEMPTION IN CHRIST.

PART II.

CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS.

- A. CHURCH AND MINISTRY.
- B. SACRAMENTS.

PART III.

ESCHATOLOGY.

- A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.
- B. FUTURE LIFE.

APPENDICES.

Nothing but the proverbial hardihood of youth could have ventured to reopen all these questions. Whether they realized or did not realize it, they were but a little group of English clerics gathered from a numerically

larger group of English Christians. Yet they were venturing to reconsider and restate a group of doctrines which the whole Christian body throughout the world had taken some nineteen centuries to formulate. That our readers may themselves judge what success was reached by this group of young Creed revisionists, we will quote two sections that are fundamental. The first is an answer to the question: What do you mean by (Credo) *I believe*? The second is an answer to the question of questions: What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?

ON ASSENT.

1. The Christian Church exists on the basis of the Gospel which has been entrusted to it.

2. General acceptance, implicit if not explicit, of the authoritative formularies doctrinal and liturgical, by which the meaning of the Gospel has been defined, safeguarded and expressed, may reasonably be expected from members of the Church.

3. Assent to formularies and the use of liturgical language in public worship should be understood as signifying general acceptance without implying detailed assent to every phrase or proposition thus employed.

4. Subject to the above, a member of the Church should not be held to be involved in dishonesty merely on the ground that, in spite of some divergence from the tradition of the Church, he has assented to formularies or made use of the Church's liturgical language in public worship.

The above considerations apply to the authorized teachers as well as to all other members of the Church; but the position of the authorized teacher is distinctive, and the Church has a right to satisfy itself that those who teach in its name adequately represent and express its mind.

5. No individual can claim to receive the teachers' commission as a right, and the commission itself involves the obligation not to teach, as the doctrine of the Church, doctrine which is not in accordance with the Church's mind.

6. If any authorized teacher puts forward personal views which diverge (within the limits indicated above) from the traditional teaching of the Church he should be careful to distinguish between such opinions and the normal teaching which he gives in the Church's name; and so far as possible such divergences should be so put forward as to avoid offending consciences.

7. In respect of the exercise of discipline within such limits as the above resolutions recognize, great regard should be paid to the need for securing a free consensus, as distinct from an enforced uniformity.

N.B.—Some members of the Commission, while not dissenting from these resolutions, are of opinion that No. 6 gives by implication too wide a latitude, and would stress more strongly the obligation resting upon all who hold office in the Church to believe and to teach the traditional doctrine of the Church. [Pp. 38, 39.]

Those whose memory goes back to the rise of Modernism and modernistic modes of interpreting Biblical and Ecclesiastical formularies will see in this skilful assembly of words a modernistic craftsmanship. For something less subtle than this method of using doctrinal and liturgical formularies which are not internally accepted, W. G. Ward, the writer of *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, was degraded by Oxford Convocation. We make no further commentary upon the section on Assent to doctrinal and liturgical formularies except to note that the appearance and "recognition" by an official commission of their (perhaps un-English) attitude towards religious truth, marks a stage in a movement which can hardly be called religious progress.

Our second quotation is from the section on CHRISTOLOGY :

Christians have from the beginning recognized Jesus of Nazareth as *Messiah* and *Son of God*. . . .

Many questions arise in the popular mind which show a true appreciation of real problems, but cannot fairly be answered in the terms in which they are stated. Such are the questions—whether Jesus Christ existed before His birth, whether He was human in exactly the same sense in which we are. . . . It is to be recognized that there is in the whole orthodox Christian position a great difficulty in reconciling belief in the eternity of God the Son *who was made man* with the equally essential conviction based on the Gospel narratives, of the truly human life of the Incarnate Christ.

This challenge to the intellect is an inherent element in the Gospel. Whether or not the intellectual difficulty can ever be

fully overcome it is our duty to be always seeking the way to solve it, provided that this is not done by neglect or observation of either of the contrasted elements that give rise to it. [Pp. 72, 73.]

Christians give to Jesus the worship due to God only. That is justifiable only if Christ is one with God in a sense not attributable to others.

The coming of Jesus Christ is not the recurrence in history of a purely historical figure, but is the manifestation in history of the Word who was in the beginning with God, and was God.

It is through the Incarnation that we apprehend the Word, and it is clear that we cannot fully comprehend the mode of being of the Divine Word as existing apart from the Incarnation . . . the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus, far from being required by orthodoxy, is inconsistent with it. [P. 77.]

At that time (Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451) and indeed until quite lately Christians did not attribute to the Incarnate Lord any limitations of knowledge, or, at any rate, any beyond the one concerning the date of the Parousia which He Himself mentioned. In this respect modern theology by a return to the Scriptures themselves, with their evidence of real surprise and disappointment as elements in the Lord's experience, has broken fresh ground.

We believe ourselves to be affirming in our Report that which was affirmed in the language of its own time by the Council. But we wish to assert that the Christian is in no way bound to the metaphysic or psychology which lie behind the terms employed by the Council. [P. 21.]

We wish we could "recognize" in the Christology of the Report the identical doctrine of Chalcedon. But the ambiguous character of the statements following on the Report's attitude towards internal assent to and external use of doctrinal and liturgical formularies, leaves our own assent suspended. The statement that "we cannot fully comprehend the mode of being of the Divine Word as existing apart from the Incarnation", has an Arian quality which suggests a compromise with the Modernists. But, again, the Report's verbal ambiguity thwarts our assent. Though the Report as a whole shows that these scholars of the Church of England have made acquaintance with the works of our Catholic theologians, that acquaintance is naturally somewhat limited. It is regrettable that in the matter of the limitations of Our Blessed Lord they

have not shown acquaintance with the classical questions : *De Scientia Christi*, in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas. It is a little difficult to know what is the "metaphysic beyond the vocabulary of Chalcedon" which they deny. As for the psychology behind the "vocabulary", they do not deny it wholly, seeing that they accept unquestioningly "the human soul"—i.e. the most fundamental and most disputed dogma of psychology.*

Instead of our own outside views on this Report we offer our readers two inside views which may give a resultant balance of truth. The Executive Committee of the Protestant Reformation Society in a memorandum says :

While it recognizes with deep thankfulness such positive affirmations of the verities of faith as are allowed expression, it deprecates the alarming concessions made to the rationalistic spirit which pervades so much modern theology, and the inadequate emphasis upon the distinctive features of the Church of the Reformation.

Among the things which disquiet the Society are

the subordination of the Articles to the devotional elements in the Book of Common Prayer . . . the indeterminate attitude of the Report to such matters as the Virgin Birth, the Empty Tomb, the historicity of miracles, and the authenticity of utterances attributed to our Lord . . . and the readiness of some members of the Commission to tolerate assent to formularies or use of liturgical language by men who frankly admit some divergence from the tradition of the Church. [*The Times*, 10 Feb., p. 11.]

In confirmation of this Protestant regret from within the Church of England there is the thankfulness of other loyal members of the Church. The Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union has passed a resolution recording its gratitude

* An American writer on Psychology is responsible for the following epigram, "The soul . . . an historic term for which we have no further use".

that the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine reflects the traditional spirit of the Church of England in its emphasis on comprehensiveness, doctrinal and ecclesiastical liberalism and appreciation that discipleship in Christ is the essential basis of membership of the Church. . . . The Council does not, of course, any more than any other body in the Church, approve every statement in the Report, but it looks forward to a period of greater unity within the Church of England and with the Free Churches. [Ibid.]

The plight of the Established Church as a statutory body may be gauged from these two statements on the Report. In its anxiety to prevent doctrinal excesses the "Protestant Committee" seems to forget its claim to rest all doctrine on the Bible and not on tradition, by denouncing the "men who frankly admit some *divergence from the tradition of the Church*". On the other hand, the Council of Modern Churchmen claims that the statutory Church of England has "a traditional spirit of comprehensiveness", forgetting that this statutory Church of England came into being with an Act of Uniformity (not of Comprehensiveness) and with a Book of Common Prayer, which ended the different "uses" of the pre-Elizabethan Church.

Are there any reasons why a Catholic in communion with the See of Peter should take hope on reading the Report? We answer frankly: "Yes." The signs of dawn are faint; but they are not few. Two may be given a hearing: First, there is the public acknowledgement that the Church of England has not doctrinal unity. This doctrinal disunity is so marked that it hinders the internal and external action of the Church of England. Courage has gone to the making of this public confession; because the hopelessness of any statutory unity other than the Crown is now more apparent than when the Commission was appointed. Since that appointment the Crown, acting through Parliament, has shown, as, for some three centuries, it has not shown, its very effective sovereignty over its statutory child the Church of England, by rejecting the Prayer Book measure. Towards

that measure the laity, the lower and the higher clergy, had contributed years of care. Their proposal was about what prayers a Church should allow its clergy to say in the churches. Nothing in the whole range of things ecclesiastical could be more definitely outside powers secular. Yet the Parliament composed in part of non-Christians showed its effective headship of the Church by rejecting the findings of the Church—and being meekly obeyed by all classes of Churchmen. The men who drew up this Report may have begun their efforts towards doctrinal unity in a spirit of hopefulness that what they agreed upon might pass into law. But the fate of the Prayer Book measure has, or should have, withered their hopes. It was then not in hope, but somewhat in humility that these men showed their longing for unity by an almost unintelligible revelation of their disunion.

This first slender sign of hope is followed by a second. There is a special "Note B" entitled *THE PAPACY*. The manifestly guarded tone of the Note allows us to discuss some faint signs of a dawn that may with God's blessing broaden into day. The Note ends with these significant words :

With regard to the Church of the future some of us look forward to a reunion of Christendom having its centre in a Primacy such as might be found in a Papacy which had renounced certain of its present claims ; some, on the other hand, look forward to union by a more federal type of constitution which would have no need for a such a Primacy.

Unless we are mistaken—and disappointed—this very distinct reference to a Church united under a Papacy is without precedent in the official or semi-official statements of the Church of England for some four centuries. If it is suggestive of "On this Rock I will build My Church", its kindling of hope may one day prove to be prophecy.

FR. VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

THE REPORT ON DOCTRINE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

TO the historians of our time, who will no doubt see its events with clearer eyes in proportion as they are less confused by the dust of immediate controversy, I recommend the working out of what is to me an interesting parallel. It seems to me that since what we used to call the War, and are now ominously beginning to call the last war, England has been governed by groups of politicians who have followed a middle line in policy, obliterating as far as possible the differences between Right and Left, instead of emphasizing them as they used to do in my youth. There have been an extreme Right and an extreme Left, noisy minorities; but the great central body of Parliamentary opinion, whether it were a Liberal or a Labour or a Conservative Prime Minister that was in office, has on the whole stuck to a middle path, not easily distinguishable from the line of least resistance. The Socialists have not been so very Socialist, and the Conservatives have not been so very Conservative. The process has culminated in the formation of a National Government, so acutely sensitive to criticism inside or outside the House, and so ready to show itself accommodating, that it will be very difficult to dislodge. During the same period, unless it be that spiritual distance has impaired my view of events, I should say that a strictly analogous process has been going on in the Church of England. A centralizing process has been at work; acrimonious debate, such as we were accustomed to in the early days of the century, has been replaced by an effort to get together and search for formulas of agreement; the minorities at either end of the scale do not, as a rule, include the men marked out for preferment. In the political sphere, Lord Baldwin was emphatically a man who had a genius for keeping his team together, even if sometimes it involved what looked like a sacrifice of principle; in the ecclesiastical sphere, the same prudence characterized the actions of the late Archbishop of Canterbury. And the mantle of either seems to have fallen

upon a successor who is prepared to honour the tradition.

This centralizing process in the Anglican Church produced, among other fruits, that abortive effort towards Prayer-book revision which was twice defeated in Parliament some years back. The Deposited Book, over which so much controversy raged, did not suggest any alteration in a document which had always been printed with the Book of Common Prayer, though it formed no true part of it—the XXXIX Articles of Religion. Lest it should be said that the Church of England, while making in general a bold effort to set its house in order, had been afraid to tackle one of the most momentous problems which Prayer-book Revision raised, a Commission was appointed in 1922 to “consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine”. Lest (presumably) its findings should complicate the delicate issues which the revision movement raised, the Commission was not encouraged to go hastily about its work; a single annual meeting, held at Oxford and at Cambridge by rotation, was judged to be sufficient allowance for the transaction of its formal business. As a result, it was only at the end of fifteen years that its findings saw the light. It is not surprising, then, if they seem curiously devoid of topical interest. The Commission’s terms of reference were presumably intended to be as wide as those of the XXXIX Articles themselves. And those articles were at many points calculated to meet the controversies of the moment; especially by repudiating the characteristic doctrines of the Anabaptists. They laid it down, for example, that Christian men’s goods are not common, and that “it is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons and to serve in the wars”. If it be asked how a Commission reporting in 1938 could neglect (and with the Archbishop of York as its chairman) to make further precisions on points which are nowadays of such acute interest, the answer is that the agenda which lay before it were mapped out not in 1938 but in 1922. The institution of marriage is dismissed by the Report in a single page; the use of marriage is not discussed at all. Plainly, the theologians who were at work on it cherished no ambitions of making a topical hit in the daily press.

Report on Doctrine in Church of England 203

For all that, the daily press made a nine days' wonder of it, and made it appear, to those of us who had not yet seen the document, and did not know the methods of the daily press well, as if a sensational departure had been made, and the Church of England were on the verge of a major crisis. I think the first inklings I had of the Report's appearance were derived from looking over the shoulder of my neighbour in the train and reading some such words as "CHURCH SAYS SEX NOT EVIL". The sub-editor, with the intelligence of his kind, evidently meant to congratulate the Church of England on its broad-mindedness in welcoming the existence of sex, and so distinguishing itself once for all from the mediaeval asceticism of those beastly Roman Catholics. More responsible organs were content to concentrate their attention on one or two doctrinal points which were familiar at least by name to the general public—hell, the Resurrection, the Virgin Birth, and so on. But they all gave you the impression, first, that the Church of England had made a weighty pronouncement, and in the second place that it was a pronouncement likely to wound the consciences of many and create an agreeable atmosphere of crisis all round.

If you proceeded to buy the document—and it sold well, on the strength of the publicity just mentioned—you found in the first place that it was not a pronouncement at all. It was a report, giving the agreed conclusions (with reservations here and there) arrived at by a mixed body of private theologians, clearing the ground for the Church of England to make a pronouncement if it saw fit. It answered not to the decrees of the Vatican Council but to the memoranda prepared beforehand and submitted to the Council, a very different thing. Nobody was committed; no legislative departure had taken place. Moreover, you were mistaken if you thought that you were going to read a series of brief theological affirmations and denials, as explicit (even) as the XXXIX Articles themselves. What you bought was a document about the length of a short detective novel, so documented with historical considerations, so hedged about with qualifications and saving clauses, that it needed a

highly trained mind to discover, if I may use a vulgar phrase, what the Commissioners were at.

What were they at, in outline? They had been chosen as men representing different points of view in contemporary Anglican theology. Not all the possible points of view: a brief reference to primacy in the Church makes it plain that there were no violent papalists to register their protest, the section on biblical inspiration would hardly have been signed by an old-fashioned Evangelical, and I think there would have been a much larger number of minority reports if, on the death of the Bishop of Ripon, his place had been taken by the Bishop of Birmingham. Still, they did differ widely, at starting; and it was hoped that they would find less to differ upon, or at least find more to agree upon, when they had exchanged opinions for fifteen years and thought out suitable formulas which would shade off the edges of their divergence as much as possible. They were not much concerned, as were the compilers of the XXXIX Articles, to define the limits of orthodoxy, in the sense of declaring that such and such a position was repugnant to Anglican principles. Occasionally they have done so, as when they observed that a strict physical determinism is inconsistent with Christianity. Occasionally, too, they have gone out of their way to record the opinion that a given theological attitude—e.g. that which denies the literal sense of our Lord's Resurrection—is not repugnant to Anglican principles. But for the most part it was their endeavour to set out the differences between various schools of Anglicanism against a background (they would say, in a context) of agreement, with the implication that the differences are not after all very serious when seen in their true perspective.

How far they have succeeded is a question which can only be judged in the light of the critic's individual approach; "important" and "unimportant" are terms you cannot measure with a foot-rule. But in general I think it can be said that the method adopted (in complete good faith, I hasten to add) by the Commission is one which can easily mislead, especially where the reader of the Report is not skilled in reading between the lines

of modern ecclesiastical language. The members themselves were surprised, it seems, at the general harmony of their proceedings; and their results will produce the same impression in anybody who judges the Report by the actual line-space allotted respectively to those doctrines which secured general adhesion, and those which necessitated a minority report. But line-space is not everything, as the following crude analogy will serve to make clear.

Suppose a Commission of four were appointed to discuss the future of Czechoslovakia, its members Lord Halifax, M. Delbos, Herr Hitler and Herr Henlein. They might find themselves in agreement on all the following points: (i) that the most essential consideration of all is the maintenance of European peace, (ii) that the country is in an unfortunate position, as having no outlet to the sea, (iii) that ideally it would be an admirable thing if Europe had no economic frontiers, but unfortunately this is a condition which cannot be realized in the present state of things, (iv) that the claims of nationality and language should, where possible, be respected, (v) that the country under discussion contains a large percentage of inhabitants who are German by race and speech, (vi) that anything like victimization of this minority by other sections of the population would be deplorable, (vii) that no solution of existing difficulties can be acceptable which does not allow for the full realization of their respective national geniuses by the Czechs on the one hand, the Slovaks on the other, and the Sudeten Deutschen on the third, (viii) that it is to be hoped time will improve the relations between the various parties concerned, (ix) that on the other hand it is high time something was done to clear up a situation which may, by the use of what is admittedly only a metaphor, be described as a powder-magazine in Central Europe. But they would have to add that (x) while on the one hand some of us feel that Czechoslovakia can only achieve her true national destiny if she is attached by more powerful links, cultural, economic, and even to some extent administrative, with some more powerful neighbour, e.g. the German Reich, others, while fully realizing the force of the arguments adduced in that sense, are unable to

resist the impression that Czechoslovakia's true interests lie more in the direction of autonomy, always under the careful supervision of the League of Nations.

This is not meant to be even a parody of the actual Report; it is only an attempt to make clear the single point that you can agree on nine heads, disagreeing only on the tenth, and yet be as far as ever from having reached a solution of the trouble you started with. Differences the Report does show; and although we all knew beforehand that such differences existed among Anglicans, it is a matter of interest to us Catholics, who, after all, have to live with our neighbours and do no good by professing complete indifference to the theological direction their minds are taking, to study those differences a little more closely. We shall find them reproduced by this Report in their minimum terms; at the point of virulence beyond which the utmost good-will, such as plainly existed among the signatories, could not reduce them. But before we consider them in detail, it will be well to give some idea of the line of theological approach taken by all the signatories in common. For there was, it is to be observed, a uniform line of approach; there was a common rule of faith, somewhat nebulously stated, but none the less genuine, which was accepted by all the members of the Commission in their deliberations. What was it?

They take Scripture as their starting-point. They feel no intellectual duty of studying the deliveries of natural theology, as we Catholics do, antecedently to all questions of revelation. Nor do they make any clear distinction, as we Catholics do, between the preambles of the faith and the deliveries of the faith itself. For us Catholics, the Bible has a two-fold place in the scheme of apologetics. We study it, the New Testament especially, as if it were an ordinary human document, possessing no special claim on our intellectual adhesion, and prove from it, first, that our Lord was the accredited ambassador of a full Divine revelation, and secondly that when he left the earth he vested his teaching office in a Church whose doctrines He promised to preserve immune from error. At a later stage, when we find that this Church has set apart certain documents of antiquity, declaring them to

be inspired by the Holy Ghost, we take up our Bibles afresh and use them, no longer as merely historical documents but as the partial means of a Divine revelation; verifying from them the doctrines already guaranteed to us by the authority of the Church. Of all this two-fold process the Anglican mind knows nothing; commonly, it has a very imperfect idea what our approach to apologetics is. The signatories of the Report adopt as their rule of faith, as the mine from which all their theological conclusions are to be dug up, what you may call an inspired-uninspired Bible interpreted by a fallible-infallible Church.

"Belief in the Bible as the inspired record of God's self-revelation is not for us a dogma imposed as the result of some theory of the mode of the composition of the books, but a conclusion drawn from the character of the contents and the spiritual insight displayed in them." This is, for the Report, a very unambiguous piece of writing. It means, evidently, that the inspiration of Scripture is something verifiable *a posteriori*; this kind of thing could not have been written, we are expected to say to ourselves, without the direct aid of God. It is not clear how, on this principle, the Commission would settle the question, whether such and such a book is canonical Scripture or not. Ideally, I suppose, we should be able to decide for ourselves, by analysis of their respective contents, that the Apocalypse was inspired by the Holy Spirit and the Pastor of Hermas was not. But for the purposes of the Report canonical Scripture is assumed as a known factor—whereas the XXXIX Articles were at pains at least to enumerate the books which they accepted and those which they rejected.

Having thus taken their stand on Scripture, the signatories proceed to qualify their adhesion by voting themselves very wide powers of taking Scriptural language in a metaphorical or allegorical sense. It is instructive to note that the terms used in establishing this and a host of other principles throughout the Report are terms which would be perfectly acceptable to Catholics, so far as they go. We also admit that there are phrases in Scripture which have to be interpreted metaphorically—it would

be impious to do otherwise. We cannot think of Almighty God, for example, as literally possessing a hand or an eye. But whereas we only invoke this principle with the Augustinian proviso that we should not "depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable, or necessity requires", no such qualification is made by our Anglican interpreters, nor, if it were, should we feel comfortable in leaving them to apply such a canon at their own discretion. What liberties they, in fact, take with the statements made in the Bible will become clearer as we go on.

The Commission thus starts out with a leaden rule in one hand—a notion of biblical inspiration which makes it possible to explain away any statement in Scripture which seems on other grounds undesirable by interpreting it as metaphor, and telling us that it nevertheless enshrines an important spiritual truth—the Story of the Fall comes under this category. The appeal made to the authority of the Church is similarly a leaden rule, which allows for almost any extent of deviation. No attempt is made to define the limits of the Church, or to locate the seat of its authority; and its tradition appears to be illustrated as freely by reference to Luther or Calvin as by reference to Catholic theologians. So strong is the power of labels that the Nestorians and the Monophysites are dismissed as heretics condemned by "the Church", without any attempt to consider whether the language held by modern theologians of repute does not fall under precisely the same heading as theirs. But in no case, I think, is any subject of modern controversy laid to rest by the Commission with the assurance that the Church has said so. Perhaps the nearest approach to such language is where the obligation of confession is discussed. "In the Middle Ages", says the Report, "the Church of England, being part of the Western Church, shared the institution of obligatory private confession. But since the sixteenth century the Church of England has abrogated the obligation." If any rogue member of the Commission asked whether in the sixteenth century the Church of England ceased to be part of the Western Church, or in the alternative what right it had to free itself from an obligation im-

posed upon it as part of the Western Church, the record passes over his interruption in silence.

It may be asked how the signatories managed to come to any theological conclusions at all, if they depended for their findings on the authority of a Bible any one of whose assertions may be understood in a symbolical sense, as interpreted by a Church which has no unity or voice by which it can express itself, a *congeries* of private theologians, any one of whom may easily be in error. Must they not have found themselves in the position of the croquet-party in *Alice in Wonderland*, at which the balls, being hedgehogs, would not stay still, and the mallets, being flamingoes, operated independently of the player? What fixed point, I mean, could be found as a starting-point, from which it would be possible to come to any conclusions at all?

The answer, I need hardly say, lies in the magic word "experience". Here again no attempt has been made to define what religious experience is, or what kind of validity can be conceded to it. Sometimes it looks as if the reference were to that quasi-mystical conviction, not depending on any process of thought, which Mr. Arnold Lunn has profanely christened the "Funny Inside Feeling". Sometimes it rather does duty for the judgements of the individual theologian, or Christian, on a given point, which as far as I have ever been able to see are simply the resultant of two forces—his education in a supernatural theology of the nursery and the philosophic or historical criticism which he has later brought to bear on it. The former explanation of the term seems indicated when we are assured that experience is our guarantee for the Divinity of the Holy Spirit. "It is through this experience that the Church has been led to speak for the Person of the Holy Spirit and to affirm his Deity and, in consequence, the doctrine of the Trinity. Much of what men have valued in this traditional language is its expression of the assurance that the Holy Spirit, as known at work in Christian society, is experienced not as an effluence from God but as God himself." I do not profess that I can follow the thought very closely; but it seems clear we should believe in Two Persons of the

Blessed Trinity instead of Three if somebody or other had not had an experience which assured him that the Holy Spirit was personally God, not a mere effluence from God. I cannot conceive how any experience, unless it were something on a level with the revelations of St. Gertrude, could yield any information on the point. Contrariwise, when we are told that "every individual ought to test his belief in practice, and . . . distinguish between what he has accepted on authority only and what he has appropriated in thought or experience", I take it that no mystical process is indicated. What is meant, if I read rightly between the lines of the passage, is that every Christian ought to say to himself, "Here is this question of belief in angels; my nurse felt certain about it, but does it seem very likely? And have I ever derived much interior satisfaction from believing it to be the truth? If not, then I must make up my mind whether to accept it on the authority of other people, which is rather a second-hand thing to do, or give it up altogether." However it be conceived, it is this odd factor of experience which ultimately decides what is the truth; if it decides against the traditional doctrine, then evidently the Bible was being metaphorical about it, and Christian antiquity cannot be accepted as a guide, because its thought-processes were antique.

It would be impossible to give any satisfactory account of the whole Report in detail; at the risk of seeming ungracious, I propose to confine myself to those points at which it shews, most startlingly, disagreement with orthodox theology as we know it. Such disagreement goes, it must be confessed, very far back. Thus, the Report gives three views as having been held in Christian antiquity about the relation of Creation to the time-process; the third of which is thus stated: "Origen's view that Creation is an eternal process was generally rejected in the Ancient Church, but this view in a different form is now held by many Christian thinkers", and the signatories add that "Christianity is not specially committed to any of these views". Immediately afterwards "the Commission desires to record its conviction that . . . it is legitimate to interpret the language, whether of Scripture or of the

Church's liturgy, with regard to angels and demons in a purely symbolical sense", and it is fairly clear from the context that several of its members were in fact stating their own point of view. As to miracles, "It is to be recognized that many others feel it to be more congruous with the wisdom and majesty of God that the . . . laws of Nature should serve his purpose without any need for exception on the physical plane"; in other words, that miracles don't happen. A reference made to this section in the Chairman's Introduction shows that in fact the Commission was divided on the point, all admitting that God could do miracles if he wished to, but some of them unable to believe that he would.

Less controversy, it seems, was aroused over the Fall of Man. The Commission managed to agree that the human race has a natural bias towards evil; but "in our view the doctrine of a universal tendency to evil in man is not bound up with the historical truth of any story of a fall", and from the silence of the context it seems possible to doubt whether any of the signatories really believed in the fall of Adam, or made any trouble about it if they did. These are large gaps, it must be confessed, in the traditional theology of Anglicanism. Pantheism, to be sure, is ruled out, and Materialism, and the evil propensity of man's will is asserted by the Commission, though they do not tell us what censure should be attached, if any, to the position of one who is hardy enough, in these times, to doubt it. Beyond that, it seems, Christianity has no certain information to give us as to where we came from, or how. Nor, very surprisingly, can I find any attempt in the report to relate the theory of evolution with the origin of the human soul. Plainly, the Church of England is not likely to put any undue strain on the consciences of its adherents where the treatise *De Deo Creante* is concerned.

It is very much more difficult to discover what the signatories believe, or want to insist on other people believing, about the whole doctrine of the Incarnation. To my own mind, the most sinister note is struck by a passage in the introduction to this section. After pointing out the difficulty of reconciling belief in our Lord as

God with belief in our Lord as truly and fully Man, the Report adds: "This challenge to the intellect is an inherent element in the Gospel. Whether or not the intellectual difficulty can ever be fully overcome, it is our duty to be always seeking the way to solve it", and so on. I confess that this refusal to contemplate the idea of mystery (a word of whose very existence the Report hardly makes one conscious) seems to me in the highest degree ominous; and the more so because this idea is replaced by that of progressive scholarly research stretching out into an unlimited future. All very well to add, by way of *caveat*, that no attempt to solve the intellectual difficulty can be tolerated if it neglects or obscures either the Divinity of our Lord or his Humanity. But what is the precise value of the assertion "Christ is God" on the lips of a man who is prepared to understand all references to angels as symbolical? To believe, as the Commission demands that we should, in the eternity of God the Son "who was made Man"—the last four words printed, somewhat disturbingly, in inverted commas—is not inconsistent with the wildest aberrations of doctrine; did anybody ever accuse Nestorius of doubting it?

Anglican scholars are slow to admit the existence of theological mysteries; they prefer the modest assumption that what seems obscure to them in a doctrine such as that of the Hypostatic Union will doubtless be much clearer to their pupils, or the pupils of their pupils. But having discarded mystery as a method of interpretation, they proceed at once to throw the whole controversy into an atmosphere of still deeper mystery by the Eleusinian darkness of their own theological expressions. Having labelled Nestorius and Eutyches heretics, the signatories admit a similar divergence as between modern views, and apparently mean us to assume that in our day only two kinds of interpretation are possible. One is the Kenotic view (according to which our Lord "became Man" by divesting himself of Divine attributes until the Divine in him was reduced to human stature). The other, one suspects, is a school which denies the personal identity of the Divine Word with the historic Christ; or why do many of them find it "not natural to use such an expres-

sion as that the Subject of that experience was the Second Person of the Trinity" ? It is then admitted that these two tendencies in modern theology, if developed in a one-sided way, lead to heresies ; but no attempt is made to rebut the accusation that they are both heretical from the start. What the Commission shrinks from saying, everywhere, is that there is in the Incarnation a Union of two Natures, and that the Union is a Personal one. After this, you are prepared to find the Report expressly admitting limitations of knowledge in our Lord, and giving a long section on his sinlessness so carefully worded as to baffle any finite intelligence.

It is not surprising, in view of known modern tendencies, that the Commission should expressly tolerate the denial of the Virgin Birth and of the physical Resurrection, though with much emphasis on the spiritual truth said to be conveyed by both. It would have been interesting to know, here especially, what proportion of votes were cast for either view, but no indication is given. The story of the Ascension is ruled out with apparent unanimity, on the ground that the Evangelists were unfamiliar with the speculations of Galileo. It would appear both from this section and from that on the real Presence that the signatories of the Report believe our Lord's physical Body to be still on earth, though they do not indulge in any speculation on its whereabouts.

It was to be expected that the long section on the Sacraments would do something to redress the balance in favour of orthodoxy. We have become so familiar with the outward assimilation of Anglican to Catholic worship during the last half-century that we should have expected the Commission to allow for, if not to encourage, specifically Catholic beliefs about the Sacraments in general and about the Holy Eucharist in particular. It cannot be said that this expectation is noticeably justified. There is considerable range of interpretation, naturally, where Eucharistic doctrine is concerned ; but it does not appear that any member of the Commission defended views on this head, which would have the remotest chance of passing for orthodox Catholic theology. When we find that one of the more advanced Sacramentalist views put

forward is prepared to illustrate the change in the consecrated Elements by reference to the identity in value between a gold sovereign and a pound note, it is difficult to resist the impression that modern devotional developments in the Church of England are significant only of an inflated theological currency. Only on two points do the signatories contrive to be more orthodox than the Pope. Some of them refuse to admit the validity of baptism conferred by an unbeliever; and all of them deny the validity of ordinations conferred by "isolated bishops who have acted apart from the authorization of any Christian body"—a notion on which comment would be superfluous. *Per contra*, they maintain that one who administers or celebrates "what publicly appears and purports to be the sacrament of the Church" does so validly, despite any "private intention on the minister's part not to perform the Sacrament". *Et pour cause*.

Unexpectedly, it is in the section on the future life that the wording of the Report sounds least unlike a Catholic utterance. Although Universalism is evidently tolerated, it is alluded to with far less enthusiasm than might have been expected. But I have left myself no space to deal with this section of the Report in detail.

What will be the practical upshot? It would be rash for an outsider to venture on prophecy. But if the Report leads to an affirmation of principles by the Anglican Church, to supersede, or to be read in conjunction with, the XXXIX Articles; if that affirmation follows at all closely the lines marked out by the Report itself—then I do not believe that a single member of the Modern Churchmen's Union will find it necessary to forfeit his position as an Anglican. I feel less certain about the reactions of extreme Low Churchmen, or extreme High Churchmen; no clear effort seems to have been made to give them representation on the Commission itself, nor does the Commission itself seem to have made any effort to spare their consciences, except by wrapping up its meaning here and there in paragraphs of intolerable obscurity. But it is to be considered that either part can still form a noisy minority in the official deliberations of Anglicanism; which makes it probable that any

Report on Doctrine in Church of England 215

attempt to follow up the Commission by legislative action will have a stormy passage in the committee stage. Meanwhile, a reading of the Report may confidently be recommended, by way of salutary admonition, to any Catholic here or on the Continent of Europe who imagines that reunion between the Church of England and ourselves could become a matter of practical politics in the course of the present century. Nobody who reads it can fail to be impressed with the good-will of the signatories, or with their learning in certain fields. But their whole conception of faith differs so completely from ours that no bridge of understanding seems, at present, to be possible. There is nothing to be prayed for except a revolution in their whole method of thought.

RONALD A. KNOX.

TO A BLACKTHORN TREE

It is as if the snowflakes, blown aslant
From drifts on pointed hills, had been but caught
By the wild-wood fingers of the tree to enchant
Its bareness ; and settling there in clusters, wrought
And carved in white, the sap ran into them,
And flake to living blossom turned. O fair
But wingless thing, with every twig and stem
Held poised for flight down winding ways to where
The green fires burn and all the glades ring loud
With joyous carolling ! In very deed,
Haply on May-Eve, when in shadowy crowd
The trees go waterward, by magic freed,
Like a dreaming bird that in his sleep takes flight,
Your loveliness would move across the night.

J. MACLEOD.

AUSTRIA AT THE CROSS ROADS

ON 12 February Herr Hitler and Dr. von Schuschnigg made an "agreement" at Berchtesgaden. I write the word "agreement" in inverted commas, because in reality it was a virtual ultimatum presented by the German Führer to the Austrian Chancellor. Under duress, Dr. von Schuschnigg agreed to Nazi penetration in the Austrian State organization, in return for Germany's continued recognition of Austria's formal independence. Because of the faith that is within him, and his high courage, he managed to save something from the wreckage. All is not lost in Austria. The Catholic Austrian barrier against the Brown pagan flood still stands. But it is necessary to face the fact that the barrier has been weakened, and further attacks on it are being planned. The Berchtesgaden agreement brings the eventual triumph of Nazism on the Danube a step nearer.

A situation has been created which raises problems of vital importance for Europe, both in the political and in the religious spheres. Politically the future balance of power on the Continent is in question. In the religious domain nothing less than the future position of the Catholic Church in the Germanic world is at stake. I will deal with both these aspects of the situation later in this article. In order to get the picture in proper perspective, it will be necessary first to recapitulate the events which led up to the February Agreement, and then to examine the effects of the Agreement itself.

Herr Hitler's desire to subject Austria to the Third Reich is of long standing. Indeed, it is probably the principal article of faith in the Nazi "Bible", the Führer's own *Mein Kampf*. It is only that circumstances have determined the manner and the timing of this latest attack on Austria's independence. Two previous attempts had been made. The first, by means of the Nazi *putsch* in July 1934, which ended in the assassination of Chancellor Dollfuss, was a failure. The next German move substituted diplomacy for force. Herr von Papen, himself a Catholic, and a moderate, was sent to Vienna as Special Ambassador with a mission of conciliation. This erst-

while member of the one-time Catholic Centre Party of Germany engineered the Austro-German Agreement of 11 July, 1936. By its terms Austria agreed to regard herself as a German State, and Germany agreed to respect Austrian independence. It was not long, however, before Nazi bad faith caused the Agreement to cease to function in all but name. For some time past Herr Hitler has been casting about for new ways and means for hurrying a "solution" of the Austrian question. Two developments, one external, the other internal, provided him with the method he was seeking, and he suddenly took action during February.

The external circumstance was Italy's inability to repeat her action of 1934, when, at the time of the Dollfuss murder, she marched an army up to the Brenner. The Abyssinian adventure had estranged Italy from Britain and France. The result was the end of the "Stresa Front" and the creation of the Rome-Berlin Axis. The idea of the Axis was Italo-German compromise in Central Europe in order that they could co-operate in the wider international sphere. The task of consolidating her Abyssinian conquest, together with her heavy commitment in the Spanish intervention, however, soon resulted in such a weakening of Italy's military position in Central Europe that she was at length unable to resist another German expansionist move on the Danube. Herr Hitler knew that however much Signor Mussolini might not like it, he would have to put a good face on it.

The internal circumstance was the German crisis which developed early this year, when senior generals of the Reichswehr expressed their objections to the Nazi Party attempts to politicize the Army, and also gave voice to their apprehensions—which they shared with various Conservative elements, including some of the professional diplomats at the Wilhelmstrasse—concerning the drive of the Nazi Radicals for intensified war on religion at home and a "dynamic" foreign policy abroad. Herr Hitler "liquidated" the crisis by retiring the generals in question. He also seized the opportunity to bring both the Reichswehr and the Foreign Office under direct Nazi control. He thus got rid of those more cautious

elements which sought to put a brake upon the advocates of a "forward" policy in Austria. Closely bound up with these considerations was the fact that owing to the internal crisis he had been obliged to postpone his special Reichstag speech. It was necessary that the speech, when he eventually came to deliver it, should contain something more positive than a mere explanation of a liquidated crisis. Austria provided the pretext for a brilliant success. All these different motives combined to make February the propitious time for a "solution" of the Austrian question.

At the same time, Herr von Papen, who had lost favour with the Führer, in connexion with the internal crisis, saw a chance to regain his esteem. He planned a new Austro-German compromise, an amplification of the Agreement of 11 July, 1936, which would make it possible for further German encroachments on Austrian sovereignty. Herr von Papen probably did not envisage the extremes to which his Leader actually went nor the brutal methods he actually employed at the Berchtesgaden meeting with Dr. von Schuschnigg. For the methods of Herr von Papen are better symbolized by the diplomatist's frock coat than by the Nazi Storm Trooper's brown shirt. The fact remains that at Berchtesgaden the only kind of diplomacy displayed on the German side was that of the big fist.

Dr. von Schuschnigg knew that behind the invitation to Berchtesgaden lurked a threat. But he went, believing that he held some strong cards. For he took with him the now famous "Teinfaltstrasse Dossier" (documents found by the Vienna police when they raided Nazi headquarters recently) which showed the existence of a plot for an uprising in Austria this summer, to be carried out in co-operation by the Austrian and German Nazis, with, finally, intervention by the Reichswehr "to restore order". He produced the dossier to show that the breakdown of the 1936 Agreement was due to German and not to Austrian bad faith. But it failed to have the hoped-for effect, for the simple reason that the line of action it disclosed was precisely the same one as that with which Herr Hitler proceeded to threaten him as the only alternative to his

acceptance of a new agreement with Germany making a mockery of Austria's independence. Thus Dr. von Schuschnigg found himself confronted by the methods of gangster diplomacy. In the elegant professional phraseology of the Chicago gunman, he had been "framed". So he returned to Vienna with what was virtually an ultimatum with a three-day time limit in his pocket.

The principal demands Dr. von Schuschnigg was obliged to accept included the appointment of Dr. Seyss-Inquart, a Pronounced National (i.e. Moderate Nazi), as Minister of the Interior and head of the Public Security Department (which controls the police): the promotion of the pro-German Dr. Guido Schmidt, then Under-Secretary, to the post of Foreign Minister; the granting to the Austrian Nazis of the same rights of political activity and propaganda, within the *Vaterlandische Front* (Fatherland Front, the Government approved organization), as those enjoyed by the Government supporters and the Monarchists; the release of Nazi agitators from prison and concentration camp; and the suppression of Austrian Press criticism of National Socialist Germany. A number of other demands—including the handing over of the War Office to a pro-Nazi, the co-ordination of the German and Austrian General Staffs, the adherence of Austria to the German economic Four Year Plan, the resignation of Austria from the League of Nations, the extension of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio-Anti-Comintern Pact to include Austria, and the orientation of Austrian foreign policy against Czecho-Slovakia—are believed to have been made and rejected. They will be pressed again at a later stage.

It is clear that even without the acceptance of all that Herr Hitler demanded, Austria had to make far-reaching concessions which practically subordinate her to the Reich in matters of wider policy and which render possible an accelerated process of Nazification from within. With his Trojan Horse inside the Austrian citadel, Herr Hitler probably felt he could well afford to make his own two concessions, i.e., the continued recognition by Germany of Austria's sovereignty, and the abstention

of German Nazis from interference in Austrian internal affairs. For while Austria's concessions were real enough, Germany's were merely formal. As soon as the truth leaked out the words were heard in every European capital: "*Finis Austriae*"; but when, on 24 February, Dr. von Schuschnigg addressed the Austrian Diet, and made his courageous "thus far and no further" declaration, the prevailing pessimism became less black. For it became apparent that Austria, although enfeebled, was not finished. Austria, the Chancellor declared, would remain an independent Catholic German State, and Austrians would serve the cause of Germanism from within their own frontiers. He ended a fine and rousing speech with the affirmation that he knew where he stood in this matter because he believed in God. There can be no doubt that by this brave stand Dr. von Schuschnigg has rallied a flagging Austrian patriotism. Not only this, but he has also re-awakened the sleeping consciences of other Governments pledged to help maintain Austrian independence.

It is necessary, however, to approach this subject with cool judgement. Regarded objectively, it becomes clear that by clever timing and an unscrupulous application of power politics Herr Hitler has scored a considerable victory. At the same time it is apparent that by a combination of courage, steadfastness and political adroitness, Dr. von Schuschnigg has succeeded in modifying that victory. Although forced to permit Nazi activity in Austria, he succeeded in confining it within the framework of the Fatherland Front, of which he is himself the head. The Nazi Party, as such, is to remain illegal, because in virtue of the present Constitution, which Herr Hitler accepted as the basis, Austria is a non-party and authoritarian State. The holding of the portfolio of Home Affairs and Public Security by the "Pronounced National" Dr. Seyss-Inquart, is counter-balanced by the retention, as Chief of Police, of the anti-Nazi Dr. Skubl. And the positions of Provincial Governors and Leaders of the provincial branches of the Fatherland Front have been amalgamated, thus bringing the governance of the different provinces directly under

the control of the Chancellor instead of being left solely to the Ministry of the Interior. These safeguards may not prevent an eventual Nazification. But they will certainly result in the *tempo* being less rapid.

Where difficulties are likely to arise—and any such difficulties are bound to be exploited by the Austrian Nazis and their German masters—is in the working out in practice of the principles established by the Berchtesgaden Agreement. There are likely to be two interpretations, one patriotic, the other Nazi. On the Austrian side there is superior statesmanship, greater finesse, more subtlety. On the German side there is overwhelming force and not a little cunning. The main point of difference, in this matter of interpretation, will undoubtedly concern the exact meaning of the compromise whereby the Austrian Nazis, although still proscribed as a political party, are to be allowed political life within the Fatherland Front. From Dr. von Schuschnigg's standpoint this means, first and foremost, the dropping of party and the giving up of agitation. It means the promotion of conciliation between Austrians holding opposed political views. It means co-operation between all concerned for the good of the German race as a whole and for the Austrian Homeland in particular. From the German and Nazi point of view it means none of these things. For the Nazis it is but a matter of taking advantage of their new, if limited freedom, to try and capture the Fatherland Front in the first place, as a spring-board for capturing the Government later on.

Already the Austrian Nazis are planning to form groups within the Fatherland Front, which would enable them to function as a party organization in all but name. This, of course, is in defiance of the February Agreement which permits Nazi co-operation within the Front, but on an individual and not on a party basis. Much the same thing happened after the 1936 Agreement. Then, as now, the Austrian Nazis frequently became restive under the restrictions agreed upon by the German and Austrian Governments. Even Berlin's explanations that these restrictions were purely of a temporary and tactical nature often failed to appease them. They did not take

kindly to discipline imposed by party headquarters in the Reich, especially when such discipline meant compromise and delay. What they wanted was rapid and full-blooded revolutionary action at home. So acute did these divergencies become that during 1937 a split in the Party ranks was with difficulty avoided. Even now, with the great advantages which have come to them in virtue of the Berchtesgaden Agreement, they are chafing at the attempts of Dr. Seyss-Inquart to carry out that Agreement both in the spirit and the letter. The Minister of the Interior's appeal to the "loyalty of the German man" has apparently fallen on deaf ears as far as the Radicals amongst them are concerned.

Undoubtedly they will endeavour to carry defiance as far as they dare in the hope that they may be able by these means to create further disturbances which would lead to a breakdown of the Berchtesgaden Agreement. For in the event of such a breakdown they undoubtedly feel that they could count upon the support of Herr Hitler for really extreme action. Should the day come, and the Radicals seize power, Europe may prepare herself to witness a blood bath in Vienna. Even Captain Leopold, extremist though he be in comparison with men like Dr. Seyss-Inquart, is believed not to desire a violent and rapid solution of that kind. This is not difficult to understand. For although Nazi ideals are not Catholic ideals, it may be admitted that amongst the Nazis there exist idealists of a kind; men who might well hesitate to accomplish their aims with the bomb and the knife if they could be accomplished by more civilized methods. For let there be no mistake about it. Amongst the more Radical elements in the Austrian Nazi rank and file are a number of desperadoes, some of them ex-Communists, who would stop at nothing. There would not only be a pogrom in the Leopoldstadt, Vienna's Whitechapel. There would also be a massacre of the Catholic clergy and the burning of churches.

Dr. von Schuschnigg, in his speech to the Austrian Diet, affirmed that the Agreement meant working for peace. He quoted as his text the words of the dying Dollfuss: "I wanted only peace," and added that the

dead do not lie. But the Nazis do not want peace. They want battle. Or, to put it another way, the only peace they can understand is peace on their own terms. Thus they will try to make the new arrangement work in the direction of *Gleichschaltung* (uniformity of régime). By these means they hope to secure the union of Austria with the Reich in all but name, on the basis of Herr Hitler's own formula of "two Länder in one Reich". For their eventual aim is the entry of all *Auslandsdeutschem* (Germans outside the Reich, including both the Germans of Austria and of the Sudetenland in Czecho-Slovakia) into the National Socialist *Volksgemeinschaft* led by Herr Hitler.

Some clue to the situation may be obtained from a consideration of the characters and records of the principal actors in the Austrian drama. Dr. von Schuschnigg himself is best described as a man who believes that the best way he can be a good German is by being a loyal Austrian. Pre-eminently he is a Catholic. He is also a Monarchist. He would like to see a Hapsburg once more occupying the Imperial Hofburg. But he would never indulge in a Monarchist adventure when the times are not propitious for a restoration. At the time of the Nazi *putsch* which culminated in the murder of Chancellor Dollfuss he took command of the situation. He assumed the Chancellorship and saved Austria. Dollfuss himself regarded him as his natural successor. And that greatest of all Austrian Chancellors, the priest-statesman, the late Mgr. Seipel, foresaw a great political future for the then youthful Schuschnigg. Supporting Dr. von Schuschnigg is a band of faithful henchmen, both in the Government, and amongst the Chancery officials; and also, of course the leaders of the Fatherland Front. A tower of strength for Dr. von Schuschnigg is Cardinal-Archbishop Innitzer, and most of the leading personalities of the Hierarchy and clergy.

On the other side of the picture is Dr. Seyss-Inquart, Herr Hitler's nominee for the post of Minister of the Interior and Security. Dr. Seyss-Inquart has been described as eighty per cent. Nazi and twenty per cent. loyal to the Chancellor. Perhaps a better description

of him would be to say that he enjoys the confidence both of Herr Hitler and Dr. von Schuschnigg. He is in sympathy with a great deal of the Nazi ideas. But he is far from being a Radical Nazi. And if he cherishes *Grosse Deutsch* ideals, of a kind hardly distinguishable from National Socialism, and stands for a close harmony and co-operation between the Third Reich and Austria, he is nevertheless consciously an Austrian. To the outside world it may seem like splitting hairs to try and differentiate him from an out and out Nazi. It is only a matter of a shade; and probably a very fine shade at that. But in Central Europe these shades have their meaning. For some time past he held the post, specially created by the Chancellor, of principal Referee for conciliation, within the Fatherland Front, between Government supporters and members of the so-called National Opposition. In addition to his new Ministerial position he is now to be in charge of a more extensive conciliation and co-ordination machinery. During the short time he has held his new position—which in present-day Austria is really a key-position, for the control of the public security forces carries with it immense power for good or ill—he has shown a considerable amount of tact. In some respects he is typically Austrian. I once met him at an informal journalistic gathering in Vienna. He spoke, it seemed to me, with two voices. Or perhaps I should say that his words could have borne one interpretation in Vienna, and a quite different one in Berlin. Dr. Seyss-Inquart is a Catholic. By profession a lawyer, he is reputed to be a man of considerable intellectual gifts. Only time will show which of his two allegiances will prove to be the stronger. It is, perhaps, significant that whereas in his speech to the Austrian Diet, Dr. von Schuschnigg coupled the words Austrian Fatherland and German People, putting the Austrian Fatherland first, Dr. Seyss-Inquart, in his first broadcast as Minister of the Interior, also coupled these two aspects of Germanism, but in his case the German People came first and the Austrian Fatherland second.

The hundred per cent. Nazis, the Radicals like Captain Leopold, the recently arrested and now released Dr.

Tavs (who was incriminated in the affair of the "Teinfaltstrasse Dossier"), and the exiled Herr Frauenfeld (who went to Germany after the Dollfuss murder), and others even more Radical than these, have no use at all for the Austrian Fatherland. There are, as a matter of fact, various shades of Radical Socialism in Austria, ranging from intransigent, revolutionary Nazism, with extreme Radical ideas, through various middle categories, to the milder type of "Pronounced National". The more extreme sections do not wish to preserve anything of Austrian autonomy. They would willingly reduce Austria to the level of a "Gau" (National Socialist District Organization). Others, less extreme, would prefer to be Ministers in an autonomous Austria, in close association with the Third Reich, than to be merely District leaders in an Austria which had become a province of Germany. All the more extreme sections are, of course, not only violently anti-Semitic, perhaps even more so than their German comrades, but they are also bitterly hostile to the Catholic Church. It is, therefore, with some misgiving that one notes the appointment, as principal assistant to Dr. Seyss-Inquart in the Conciliation Department of the Fatherland Front, of Dr. Hugo Jury, one-time Storm Troop Commander.

Dr. Guido Schmidt, the new Foreign Minister, is pro-German rather than Nazi. He is young and ambitious. When Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, he gained the confidence of the Chancellor, but he nevertheless managed to make himself *persona grata* with the Germans when on missions to Berlin. My own impression is that Dr. Schmidt, being shrewd, always believed in the inevitability of some such compromise as that which has now taken place, and has consequently been careful to have a foot in both camps. If these were his calculations, they certainly brought him rapid advancement in office. He is believed to aspire to the Vice-Chancellorship. Some people say that he has his eye eventually on the Chancellorship. But that is a post which, in the event of Austria taking a sudden turn towards Nazism, would much more likely fall to Dr. Seyss-Inquart. In the event of a thorough-going Nazi revolution, and the

seizing of power by the Radicals, Dr. Schmidt would quickly be removed from office as being too moderate.

With regard to the Austrian people as a whole, it would be accurate to assess their allegiance as being approximately one-third for the Government, one-third Socialist opposition, and one-third Nazi. But percentages are apt to be misleading. For, as I have already indicated, the so-called National Opposition is composed of various shades of "nationally minded" opinion. Also, a not inconsiderable proportion of it are not Nazis by conviction at all, and are merely lined up with them because for one reason or another they do not like the present régime. Then there is the usual indeterminate and not very politically minded section of the public which wings this way or that according very largely to economic circumstance. There are also the Monarchists. But they may be counted amongst the Government supporters. Since February the balance has altered somewhat. For even though Herr Hitler's speech may have gained some new adherents to the Nazi cause in Austria, Dr. von Schuschnigg's speech rallied a greater number to the patriotic cause. Another important change is that, faced with the threat of the Nazification of Austria, large numbers of Austrian Socialists, hitherto bitterly opposed to the Government, have since rallied to Dr. von Schuschnigg on the independence issue.

If it were purely a matter of the internal situation, the present balance of forces in Austria could well continue as it is for an indefinite period, and in such a situation Dr. von Schuschnigg's régime could remain in office almost permanently. The danger, as the Chancellor always realized, is from without. What happened at Berchtesgaden has since proved him to have been right.

This leads me to an amplification of my statement at the beginning of this article that the new situation created by the Berchtesgaden Agreement raises problems of vital importance for Europe in both the political and the religious spheres.

In the event of Herr Hitler believing that the other European Powers will do nothing to protect what little is left of Austrian independence, he may be tempted to try

another and possibly final *coup* which would make of Austria nothing more nor less than a German outpost on the Danube. That would mean that in the politico-economic-military sense Germany and Austria would be virtually one country. Such a state of affairs would place Germany in the position to reduce Czecho-Slovakia to the level of a vassal State, and also to secure a predominant politico-economic influence in Hungary and the Balkans. Germany would by these means obtain the hegemony of Europe from the Baltic to the Balkans. This would enable her to start her *drang nach Süden*, with the recovery of the German-speaking South Tyrol from Italy as her aim. Finally, bestriding Europe like a Colossus, she would be able to challenge Britain and France. Hence, if Signor Mussolini has not entirely turned his eyes away from the realities of the Alps towards the dream of the Mediterranean, he would do well to join with the rest of Europe in crying halt to Germany's plan to create a German controlled *Mitteleuropa*. Britain and France likewise would do well to realize that it is in their interest no less than it is in Italy's to help preserve the Catholic, universalist conception of Germanism, which is the Austrian conception, against the "racial State" interpretation of Germanism as typified by National Socialism. For although events in Central Europe may be further away from Paris and London than from Rome, the German hegemony of Europe would in the final instance be equally a threat to all three. The only difference is in the time factor. The first impact would be on the Brenner. The next would be in Western Europe.

A purely Italian defence of Austrian independence would do more harm than good, even if it were now possible, which is no longer the case. The fatal mistake made by Britain and France was the shirking of their contribution to the international obligation of preserving Austrian independence by declaring, as they did in 1934, that Austria was a specifically Italian interest. The exclusively Italian defence of Austria four years ago soon developed into a veritable Italian protectorate, a situation which caused the Austrian Government to lose many supporters to the Nazis. At that time the Italian pre-

dominance in Vienna also had the result of causing acute suspicion in Yugoslavia and thus militated against the creation of a Danubian barrier against German expansion in Central and South Eastern Europe.

Finally it led to the situation—after the creation of the Rome-Berlin-Axis—of Italy “selling out” to Germany in Central Europe in return for German support of Italian Mediterranean aspirations. Austria, as Dr. Benes, President of Czecho-Slovakia, once declared, is an international interest. It is an interest affecting herself, her Danubian neighbours and Europe generally. No single neighbour alone should decide Austria’s destiny. Therefore, the matter of her independence should have been dealt with by international guarantee. It is said that nothing is ever too late in diplomacy. Perhaps it is not too late now. Although it is obvious that what might have been done quite easily in 1934 would be much more difficult in 1938.

This brings me to the last, and the most important consideration: the situation as it affects the Catholic Church.

The importance, from a Catholic point of view, of the preservation of Austrian independence is beyond question. For not only is Austria the last stronghold of Catholicism in the Germanic world; she is also the rallying point for the persecuted Catholic Church in the German Reich. This, of course, is realized in Berlin no less than in Vienna. The Nazis desire that there should be no such Catholic rallying point. Hence, one of the principal aims behind Herr Hitler’s latest demand for the muzzling of the Austrian Press is the desire to prevent publicity being given to utterances by the Austrian Hierarchy in sympathy with their persecuted brethren in the Reich. This part of the Agreement has already been implemented, in a new press law introduced on 25 February. It may be readily understood, therefore, that during the fateful days following the Berchtesgaden meeting, the Austrian Hierarchy, including the Primate, Cardinal-Archbishop Innitzer, strongly urged Dr. von Schuschnigg to resist Herr Hitler’s more extreme demands. For not only are the Austrian bishops and

clergy patriotic. They are also the guardians of the Catholic tradition in their country, which is linked with the Catholic tradition in Germany. They have seen what has happened in the Reich: the closing down of Catholic schools; the suppression of the Catholic Youth Movement; the propagation of the neo-pagan "religion" as against Christianity; the deification of the State; the persecution of the clergy and the faithful. They dread the thought that one day perhaps the same things might happen on the Austrian side of the frontier.

That the Holy See takes a grave view of the situation is made clear by the official Vatican organ, the *Osservatore Romano*, in its issue for 27 February. The paper affirms that the independence of Austria is one of the cardinal requirements of European harmony, and adds: "There is much talk of language, race and blood as being the elements giving the right to rule. Such a right cannot be admitted if other profound and vital characteristics are lacking." This is a flat rejection by the Church of the German claim to rule Austria by virtue of racial affinity, when considerations of religion and international morality are ignored by the claimant.

Signs are not wanting that Herr Hitler, aware of the alarm which has spread throughout the Germanic Catholic world as a result of the Berchtesgaden *coup*, will seek to allay suspicion by instructing the party Radicals to modify their anti-religious campaign in Germany. While any alleviation of the lot of persecuted Christians in Germany is to be welcomed, it is necessary not to mistake what is clearly only a tactical move, and a temporary measure of political expediency, for a genuine change of heart. As I explained in my article on the "Church in Germany and Austria" in *THE DUBLIN REVIEW* for April 1937, such things have happened before and have always ended in disillusionment for the Catholics. In the present case the persecution would be redoubled as soon as Austria was captured.

In that article I quoted from an article by the distinguished Catholic writer, Dr. Waldemar Gurian, in the Austrian Catholic review *Christliche Ständestaat*. I would like to repeat here one of his observations, which

is very apposite to the present situation. "National Socialism," Dr. Gurian declares, "always tries to lull its adversaries to sleep" . . . "the sort of Catholicism which adopts a negative attitude towards National Socialism is lacking in courage and bound to be exploited for propaganda purposes by its Nazi persecutors, who, having thus used the Church, will then throw her contemptuously aside."

I would end by quoting from a recent sermon delivered at Munich by that great Catholic and noble German, Cardinal Faulhaber. Bolshevism and Nazism, he declared, fight each other, but both join in hating the Catholic Church.

C. F. MELVILLE.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Since writing the foregoing article there have been swift and dramatic developments. The breakdown of the Berchtesgaden Agreement, and subsequent intervention of Hitler in Austria, suggested in the article as being the German Nazi plan, are now accomplished facts. Hitler has entered Austria with an invading army, and proclaimed that country as henceforth a province of the Reich.

The events which led up to this may be briefly recapitulated: Dr. von Schuschnigg, aware of the Nazi plan, decided upon a last throw of the dice. He announced a plebiscite on the issue of a "Free, Independent, Catholic, German Austria". Hitler and the Nazis had been demanding a plebiscite for years. "Now they shall have it," the Austrian Chancellor declared. Hitler, knowing that the result of the plebiscite would be a substantial majority in Schuschnigg's favour, decided to stop it. On Friday, March 11, he delivered two ultimatums, one demanding the cancellation of the plebiscite, the other the resignation of Schuschnigg and his replacement by Seyss-Inquart, under threat of sending the Reichswehr into Austria. Both demands were complied

with. But although the last ultimatum was not due to expire before 7 p.m., the German army actually crossed the frontier one hour earlier.

With regard to the main personalities in the Austrian drama : the ex-Chancellor, Dr. von Schuschnigg, is under "house arrest" in Vienna, as is also Herr Miklas, the ex-Federal President. Dr. Guido Schmidt seems to have disappeared into obscurity. Nothing further has been reported of him. Dr. Seyss-Inquart enjoyed a few days as Chancellor, in succession to Dr. von Schuschnigg, and is now Provincial Governor. For Vienna now is merely a provincial capital. Herr Hornbostel, late permanent head of the Austrian Foreign Office, is believed to have been arrested, as also Colonel Adam and Dr. Ludwig, both of whom were at different times heads of the Austrian official Press department. Baron von Kleinwächter, one of the most important of the assistant heads of the Press department, has also been arrested. All these were Catholics. Amongst the suicides are Major Fey, one-time Heimwehr leader and Minister of Security, and Baron Neustadter-Stürmer, one-time Minister of Security. Exit the old régime *in toto*.

It is too early yet to arrive at a final verdict as to Dr. Seyss-Inquart. In my article I wrote of him as a moderate. Probably this still holds good. It seems likely that he really hoped to pursue a course of "gradualness", but that he was carried along by the tide. Many of these "Pronounced Nationals" and moderate Nazis had hoped to have a National Socialist Austria acting in close association with the Reich, but still maintaining some kind of local administrative and cultural autonomy. Many of them hoped to be Ministers in the government of such an Austria. Probably they did not expect events to move as rapidly or as drastically as they have done. As things are, it is the Radicals who have achieved their purpose of complete *Anschluss*. The present moderates in the provincial governorship are not likely to remain for long. They will soon be replaced by more radical elements. Dr. Seyss-Inquart now gives the impression of a somewhat feeble personality. At all events, it is said that when, at the end, he "ratted" as

completely as he did, this was a very bitter pill for Dr. von Schuschnigg to swallow. He had hoped that Dr. Seyss-Inquart would remember he was an Austrian as well as a National Socialist. In this, as in many other things, Dr. von Schuschnigg was tragically disappointed.

At the time of writing, the assimilation of Austria to the German Reich and the National Socialist organization is proceeding apace. The terror is in full swing. The prisons are filling up with victims, not only Communists and Socialists, but also people of Conservative political outlook—Aryan and non-Aryan alike—who had supported the Schuschnigg régime. Himmler's S.S. Black Guards are victimizing especially Catholic officials. The Jews are being terrorized by bands of S.A. youths. Suicides are daily occurrences in Vienna. In the provinces arrests of priests have begun.

So much for the internal situation. Externally the absorption of Austria by Germany constitutes a new politico-economico-military menace to Europe. It is not possible to exaggerate the danger. Events are bound to continue to move quickly, and the next German threat will undoubtedly be to Czechoslovakia. Eventually Germany will threaten Western Europe.

Culturally and spiritually the Austrian tragedy is beyond words. This is thoroughly well understood at the Vatican, if not by certain Catholic circles in England which have failed to understand the strength of the anti-Christian forces within the Nazi Party. There was always the hope that Austria might have been the rallying-point of religion and the true German culture throughout the entire Germanic world. Now Austria is dead. And with her death goes also the last vestige of that hope.

C. F. M.

TERROR IN OUTREMER

THE situation in Palestine is, daily, becoming more critical. Above all else Britain is faced with the necessity of quelling trouble in the Holy Land as quickly as possible. It has now ceased to be a simple matter of providing security for the experiment of the Jewish national home, and has become a matter of vital imperial strategy. This has been forced upon us by the deteriorating world position, by the growing imminence of a struggle between the so-called "democratic" and the totalitarian Powers. With the threat to the world's last great market for European and American products offered by the Japanese conquests in China, the position has grown still more inflamed and acute. It goes without saying that the British Empire would not have so meekly borne the intolerable insults and injuries offered by the unruly soldiers of Japan if it had been in a position actively to resent them. The fact is self-evident, from even a cursory comparison of strengths, that the unsupported British Navy cannot fight a victorious war with the Japanese fleet in Eastern waters and still maintain her position in the Mediterranean. The whole of our strength would be necessary to cope with the Japanese Navy, and if we dispatched our ships to Singapore and Hong Kong the somewhat obsolete fighting-ships of France would be overpowered by the more modern squadrons of Germany and Italy.

Without the command of the Mediterranean, France could not bring her colonial reinforcements by the direct route from North Africa, and, although arrangements are being made for them to be shipped from Casablanca by way of the Atlantic sea-lane, these plans are far from complete. Even if they were perfected, the absence of our war vessels would leave the troopships vulnerable not only to the submarines of the Fascist States but to aircraft based on a Nationalist Spain. Again, although the alliance of the United States of America would mean a preponderating strength in the Pacific, there is little likelihood, at present, of the great majority of American voters being willing to abandon

their traditional isolation and throwing themselves into a foreign war. Even if a combined British and American fleet commenced a "long-range" blockade of Japan, so many of our ships would have to be detached to co-operate in the manœuvre that European and Mediterranean waters would be left in a very precariously held position.

The European, or rather the world, situation has thus become a game of deadly chess, with both sides making every endeavour to gain the opening that will enable them to strike hard at their adversaries. In such a game every pawn is of the utmost value, and Palestine is far from being a pawn; it is, because of its geographical position, more of the rank of rook. A disaffected Holy Land is a source of weakness to the democratic countries and a point of vantage to the "dictator" States. To make that point clear it is essential to visualize what would happen in the unhappy event of hostilities breaking out between Britain and Japan. It is quite inconceivable without a U.S. alliance that we should start such a war, but it is not at all unlikely that the struggle might be foisted upon us if our potential enemies should become convinced of their advantage in so doing.

Germany, Italy, and, conceivably, Roumania, might declare war, or, in the modern fashion, strike at our vitals without troubling about so archaic a formality. France would be in no case to support us; without her colonial troops the Maginot line might not prove so impregnable as it is vaunted to be. Even allowing for Germany remaining officially neutral if France failed to support us, we should still have Italy to face—and Fascist Italy is no hollow sham, no easily defeated foe. The first effect of the opening of war would be to render the sea-routes of the Mediterranean impossible for merchant shipping. Italian air and naval bases commanding the narrows between Sicily and Cape Bon would ensure that. Malta would be untenable. In reply we could close the Straits of Gibraltar and cut the Italian communications with her East African Empire, but we could do little to prevent reinforcements reaching Libya and Cirenaica. Our

attenuated garrison in Egypt would be doomed, and, vast though the distances may be, there is naught to prevent a new channel of communication overland between Ethiopia and Libya, once all danger from the Egyptian flank is obviated.

It may be argued that a blockade of Italy would reduce that country to despair, even a long-range blockade from Suez and Gibraltar; but a closer scrutiny of the facts does not bear this out. It may even be granted that the Italian railways are in no state to help to any major degree in bringing in, from a sympathetic if neutral Germany, the imports which formerly came by sea. But—and this is important—most of Italy's imports are re-exported; to a very great extent she is self-supporting—at least she could manage on her own reserves and products for well over a year. Yet in one essential of modern warfare she *is* deficient—she has no oil, and without oil, warships, aeroplanes, and armoured fighting-vehicles are impotent. But even that consideration is cancelled by the outstanding fact that there is no certainty of Turkey closing the Dardanelles—Turkey is not hostile—Italy holds none of her lost provinces—it was Greece, through the chicanery of those who defrauded Italy of her promised rewards, who was thrown out of Asia Minor. Roumania, the oil-field supplying Italy, is now sympathetic—and would be glad to provide her sister-State with all it required. This is precisely where Palestine becomes of so paramount a value. Haifa forms the perfect counterpoise in the Eastern basin to Gibraltar in the Western. Even if Egypt were lost to an invasion from Libya, Palestine could still be defended from the line of the Canal, backed by a powerful force in Palestine. That force could be composed of Indian and Australian contingents landed at Akaba on the Red Sea.

Haifa, with the long hog-back of Mount Carmel behind it, can* be most easily rendered impregnable both to naval and air attack. We have already built a large harbour there, sufficient to shelter the few ships we might be able to spare from the Japanese adventure. Cyprus

* Haifa in the 1935-36 crisis was strongly fortified. Heavy guns from Gibraltar were mounted on Carmel's flanks.

is too close to Rhodes and the Italian bases in the Dodecanese Islands, but Haifa has that little extra distance which would enable strong squadrons based in the hinterland, or in secret aerodromes in the Syrian Desert, to be able to deal effectively with raiders. Haifa, in short, is our answer to the possibility of Italy being able to use the Dardanelles for her oil transports in the event of war, whilst we shall have the pipe-line bringing the essential mineral straight to our own fighting-machines, whether water, or air, borne. To sum up: in the ticklish world situation obtaining at the moment Gibraltar may be essential at its own end of the Inland Sea, but Palestine is every whit as necessary in the east, both as a potential threat to Italy with the hosts of colonial, dominion, and Indian troops which can be brought there, without danger from Italian war vessels, whether submersible or surface, and for its potentialities as a blockade base for submarines, destroyers, and aircraft to harry the Italian oil-tankers steaming out of the narrow gut of the Dardanelles. Again, quite apart from its strategical possibilities in the event of war with Italy, or as a piece in the intricate and perilous game of bluff and counter-bluff at present obtaining, Palestine is essential to this country from a purely commercial viewpoint. It is now, more than at any time during its long history, the land-bridge between two great continents—the cross-roads of the world. Our commercial air-lines to and from Britain and the East must pass through it; the oil pipe-line at Haifa saves days and thousands of pounds in the transport of that vital commodity; and, finally, Haifa, with the development of the vast hinterland behind it, will become the tap through which many millions of pounds' worth of trade will eventually flow.

Apart from these purely physical and material calculations, there is the moral advantage to be gained by the fact that we are the guardians of the holy places. That may be an intangible and immaterial fact, but so is the advantage we glean; prestige can neither be touched nor felt, but it is real none the less. It is useless to pretend that our present methods in Palestine are not dictated by the urgency of the political and

strategical situation. It is little recognized in this country how heavily the iron heel of militaristic rule is grinding into the souls of the Palestinians. An unobtrusive but supremely efficient censorship prevents the British public from realizing what stern measures are being executed, though the rest of Europe is shocked by what we are doing. If it were not for the vital matters concerned the present policy would be unpardonable—Ireland still quivers with hatred at the mere mention of the Black-and-Tans, yet it did not suffer one quarter so badly as the Holy Land is doing.

The policy of military rule is logical—it may be brutal, it causes much suffering to innocent people—persons who have made no political transgressions, who had no sympathy, at the commencement, with the fomentors of disorder, have, unavoidably, been made to suffer with the guilty—but, at least, though it is no palliative, the principle of rule by force is logical. Our right in Palestine is the unarguable right of the conqueror—we took it by force and we shall hold it as long as we wish, or are physically able, to do so. Those who rebel against the conqueror must expect to feel the conqueror's mailed fist—for that conqueror will only be able to remain so long as he is master. It may be argued that this applies with particular force in such a land as Palestine, an oriental country worshipping and respecting force—a country which has been subject to conquest for close on three thousand years, with never a moment of real independence in thirty centuries. That is probably true—but the pity is that the determination to use military force to preserve order was not made evident nineteen years ago. Then there would have been none of the present bloodshed and disorder—the Palestinians would have settled peaceably down, to live with the minimum friction under their new overlords, watching with ancient, malignant calm for the next turn of history's wheel to bring in another and stronger nation to rule them after throwing out their erstwhile masters. Palestine has seen so much of that sort of thing, both before and since the day when the great sheikh

Joshua ben Nun led his fierce Bedouins of the Hebrew confederacy across the Jordan four thousand years ago.

Now, this is exactly where we have been so wrong, so unwittingly callous, and so unthinkingly cruel. Alone of that vast cavalcade of conquest we have encouraged the Palestinians to think of freedom, of independence. All such thoughts had long since vanished from their brains; many centuries of vassalage had made them content to serve and gradually assimilate the conquerors. Whilst the older generation were still in the forefront, the generation who were men at the time when Allenby strode through the Jaffa Gate of Jerusalem in December 1917, the deception did not matter. But now, in 1938, a new factor has arisen. The children who were infants at the end of the War, the young men who have grown up with no recollection of the Turkish suzerainty, have been educated in schools which we have provided. They have been instructed and exhorted to think of themselves as citizens of a free State, and now they find that they are betrayed.

One has only to walk through a small Arab village to find the evidences of the political tension in the outside world prominently displayed. There you may see wireless receivers, either freely bestowed, or sold at a mockery of their usual price, with their reception locked, incapable of movement, so that they may only receive the messages from one particular wave-length. The supply of batteries is carefully maintained, and from the loud-speakers, unchecked, pours a stream of poisonous propaganda, exhorting the Arabs to remember that the League of Nations once promised them freedom. Incitement against the British overlords, against the French masters in Syria, is violent and prolonged. For over twenty years we have encouraged the Arab to think in terms of the modern world, and now, when we have trained him, we turn upon him with all the terrors of Black-and-Tan Ireland. Men are hanged for being in possession of rifles, and the Arab's boast has always been that he carries arms. The British judges are capable, honest, hard-working, and they take the greatest care to sift the evidence—but they can know little of the

deadly intrigues, the *faszad*, which Arab uses against Arab. Terror lurks everywhere, not an Arab but is afraid of some secret denouncement carried to the British military, of a rifle hidden, unbeknown to him, in his *tibbin*, the chaff of his feed-barn. The shadow of the noose and the concentration-camp is very black over the hut-villages of the *fellabin* and the long black tents of the Bedouin.

By this it is not meant that any of the Arabs so far executed or imprisoned by the military courts have not been rightly condemned. The bulk of the evidence shows that, according to their own stern code, the Army tribunals have been on the side of mercy; those executed have been persons caught red-handed, or known to have been engaged in sub-war against the British forces. Houses, homes, blown up by Royal Engineers, a whole quarter of a city destroyed, ruinous collective fines on hard-hit towns and struggling villages, may have the effect of immediate intimidation, but they leave behind, as they did in Ireland, a gathering storm of hatred and discontent which nothing can ever quell. The point that it is desired to make is that, if we had desired to govern in this stern manner, it should have been done from the very outset, not now, after we have encouraged the Arab to treat us with good-natured contempt.

The worst feature of the whole problem of Palestine is that there is so much of right on every side. The British commanders enforcing this repressive code are perfectly right from their own standpoint. They cannot allow the country to grow still more rebellious until their control is lost, and their only course, after years of mismanagement by the civil power, is to use the sword and gallows. This settles nothing, but it may bring to an end, temporarily at least, the murders of British soldiers and police and allow the administration to resume control. Space does not allow any detailed description of how criminally feeble the Palestine Government has been in dealing with armed revolt, and now, as usual, it is the unfortunate military power which must bear all the odium for restoring order.

Other factors in the world situation also affect Pales-

tine very directly. For instance, the threatened anti-Semitic measures of Roumania will, if carried through, still further complicate our distress in the Holy Land. These unfortunate people must be allowed to go somewhere if they are expelled, and Palestine seems to be the only natural place for them. In any case no other land will receive them, and they cannot be allowed to stand in a wretched line on a frontier and there to perish of starvation between two hedges of expellent and repellent bayonets. The Nazi Government of the Third Reich, and Poland as well, have no use for the Jews still remaining within their respective borders. Where are these unfortunate people to go, save to the motherland of their race? Here again actual facts must be faced. It is all very well to speak of the "absorptive capacity" of Palestine, but it is certainly true that, with hard work, self-abnegation, and the small capital these people possess, another two to three million Jews could be settled in the Holy Land without causing suffering to a single Arab. But that is a point which no Arab can be expected to understand. The Palestine Government has allowed virulent agitation to continue unhindered for so long that the simple Arab now believes that far more Jews than can live in their own part of the country have already arrived. Any further mass immigration will provoke civil war and massacre.

It must be remembered that the Palestinian Arab does not stand alone. At present the danger of a sudden outburst throughout the Islamic world may be remote, but it is, nevertheless, a contingency which must be reckoned into the account. Islam is weak and divided today, weaker even than it was when the hosts of the First Crusade managed to force their way to Jerusalem, but there are indications in plenty that a second Saladin will soon, within the next few years, make Islam once more a foe to be respected. Nothing will sooner bring this to pass than long and sustained propaganda blaring that the Holy House of Akhsa in Jerusalem is threatened with Jewish or Christian defilement, and you may already hear that sort of nonsense spewing from the locked loud-speakers of the free radio-sets. To epitomize the

situation in the Holy Land as it stands at present is not easy. Maybe it can best be done by taking each party to the dispute separately, and looking at the problems facing it, as well as the means each is employing to meet its crisis.

Great Britain is desperately anxious for a united, happy, prosperous and loyal Palestine—that will give her the only prospect of a secure base in the event of war in the Mediterranean. Her potential enemies are doing their utmost to foment disaffection amongst the Arab peoples, to cause them to distrust and resent the British occupation. Again, we are, in honour, bound to protect and safeguard the Jewish settlers whom we have allowed to enter the country, believing in our pledge that they shall be given security of life and property to rebuild their ancient home. This promise, sacred though it is, is for the moment forced into a secondary position by the sheer, animal necessity for self-preservation, which can only be achieved by our having a quiet Palestine on which to base our imperial strategy in the Eastern Mediterranean. Our third problem is, for the moment, in the face of the more urgent dangers, of minor importance—the preservation of the rights of the Arabs and the prevention of any feeling of hatred throughout the Islamic world by any suspicion that we have betrayed our trust. Unfortunately, our own desperate need has forced us into a course which we never contemplated—the choice of the lesser evil. The Palestinian Arab is the weakest, the party unable to make its voice felt, and, consequently, the one which must be crushed. Brutal, but perfectly logical. If our own safety depends upon a quietened and submissive Palestine, then we must crush all opposition, and the simplest way to do it is by trampling down the Arab resistance. Internationally the Jews are too powerful—if they were as weak as the Arabs then there can be little doubt that, in view of the huge Moslem population in the British Empire, they would have been chosen as the unavoidable victims.

For years Palestine has been misgoverned—there is no use in blinking the fact. Whose fault that is it is difficult to compute. Certainly the personnel of the

Palestine Government, and the people controlling that Government from Whitehall, have not been so good as it is the British tradition to be in matters colonial—but inefficient, or unwilling, or merely ignorant, whatever might be the true explanation, it is doubtful if the best administrators in the world could have succeeded in the face of the dreary tangle of Woodrow Wilsonisms which have plagued the Near and Middle East since the ending of the Great War. To any intelligent observer it seems that Woodrow Wilson's idealism, baulked by self-interest and greed in Europe, was distorted, botched, and twisted and then inflicted upon the unfortunate people of the Levant. The whole system of mandates was sheer hypocritical lunacy; the Arab understood conquest and he knew the virtues of submission—but he was merely pixie-led when it came to mandates. No one has less admiration for the Palestine Government, especially for its policy in the years up to 1933, than the present writer; but even officials with ten times the efficiency and the keenness of the men who sat in power in Jerusalem would have had all that they could do, in face of the chaotic conditions, to bring a happy and contented Palestine into the sunshine of independence.

It is little wonder that the civil power in Palestine has failed when one considers how it was formed—of what discordant elements, raw, untrained, and inexperienced, it was composed. Now, when it is fifteen years too late, with gallows, flame, bullet, bayonet, bomb, and explosives, the British Army has been given the hideous task of achieving the impossible—a pacified Palestine. That is perhaps a wrong statement. A pacified Palestine we may achieve on the lines of making a desolation and calling it peace, but a loyal Palestine we shall never see, and surely the effects of a foreign overlord alienating the loyalty of the Palestinian folk were only too apparent in how they assisted us to expel the Turks from their land. It is not going too far to say that they will be even gladder to see the last British soldier leaving the Holy Land, or that they will give even heartier support to any enemy of the Empire which has sent their houses hurtling up in the blast of explosions, their sons to the

gallows* and their women and children to starve, the families ruined by the colossal collective fines levied on communities who have had the evil fortune to be living close to the scene of some outrage committed against British troops or police.

Second in consideration come the Jews. These poor folk are deserving of all sympathy and all pity. For two thousand years they have been pariahs, despised and rejected of men. Any other people would long ago have disappeared; certainly none could have retained through that long night of despair and suffering the gallant hearts and brave outlook which you will see aflame in every colony in Palestine. They too are victims of the prevailing madness which is sweeping the world, not only for the persecutions they endure in anti-Semitic States, but because the sheer, grasping necessity staring in Britain's face is causing their own fair dream of a restored nation in the land of their forefathers to wither and die even before the plant has reached its full fruiting. They have cherished the ambition of living as a free and independent people on the sacred soil of Palestine, a Jewish race, a nation once again to be numbered amongst the owners of the world; but already they see that any present fulfilment of that vision is impossible—their one chance of survival is to accept a quasi-vassal condition of being a Dominion of the British Commonwealth. One may talk so long as one chooses of the complete independence of the Dominions, that each is a free and independent nation—and at the end know that one is talking naught but nonsense. In law the position may be as we state it, but law is merely a figment of man's brain and exists only so long as it can be enforced. How long would Australia's boasted independence last if Britain were involved in some major war and Japan took a fancy to move her entire population to the island continent to give them more room and scope? There was a cynical saying not so long ago, "We hold Australia, New Zealand, and Hong-Kong by the grace of God and

* Five Arabs were hanged in the four days between 22-25 January, 1938. The executions were carried out within a few hours of the passing of the death sentence.

the favour of the Japanese." In even stricter fact, would not a Jewish Dominion in Palestine be a completely vassal State, entirely dependent upon Britain's goodwill for its continued existence?

That is as it may be. The Jewish dream of a free Jewish homeland, of a new kingdom of Israel, is already fly-blown. It can never exist. Why? Because it would be dependent, at least for the first decade or two, upon the goodwill of the surrounding Arab States, and that goodwill has now been lost for ever by the actions of the Jews' protector, the British Empire. It will take at least three generations to water down the bitterness of those exploded houses, those hangings, and the distress and starvation of hard-working farmers and their families pauperized by the payment of colossal collective fines. When the situation alters, when the present political world tension either detonates or else disappears, and Britain decides that the usefulness of Palestine is at end, the tiny Jewish State, if it is ever erected, will be doomed as surely as was ancient Judea when it defied Assyria, or when Vespasian and Titus his son marched the legions out of Acre, and deployed across the plain to the attack of their first enemy fortress, Jotapata, on its tooth-like peak in Galilee.

There was once the chance for peace and amity between Jew and Arab. That was on the day when the Zionist leader and great patriot Dr. Chaim Weizmann signed his agreement with the Emir Feisal in 1919; but it was allowed to pass, and it can never come again. On that day the Arab leaders believed that Britain would act as every other conqueror had done, vigorously holding her conquests, enforcing her will on a people only too ready to submit to, and accept, whatever the new overlord desired. We made it obvious that we had no intention of doing the deeds of conquerors—for nineteen years we have lain down to every little agitator or chieftain who wished to kick us—time and again we have failed in our duty to protect the Jewish settlers who trusted us—and instead of winning the gratitude of the Arabs we have earned their contempt. Today, when it is many years too late, when they are tacitly supported by our

potential enemies, we are trying a system of military bullying and tyranny, and even that is not being carried to its logical conclusion—the civilian officials being like a mother who has had her unruly son haled before the magistrate, and who now flutters round the policemen who have to apply the ordered birching, trying to save the child she herself betrayed, not for any love she bears it, but because she is afraid of what the boy may do when he comes home.

Last of all there is the Palestinian Arab—what is his position—what does he think of this cataclysm of military tyranny which has swept down upon him? To answer that question it is necessary to show what sort of a man he is. There are three main types, the townsman, the *fellah* or peasant farmer, and the nomadic or semi-nomadic Bedouin. They are alike in one thing, their sturdy conservatism evidenced by a zealous belief in their faith and their intolerance of all other creeds. In the main they are decent, hard-working men with a keen sense of humour, and more than willing to get along smoothly with their neighbours, except when the dreadful *faszad* is alive. *Faszad* is a word with no counterpart in English; it means the system of lies, intrigues, misrepresentations, and maddening insinuations which often lead to murder and worse. The Arab of the older generation is a very practical man, anxious only to avoid trouble with the authorities and to be left in peace. He is generally illiterate, but, like all peasants, a shrewd and careful bargainer; only when some educated agitator—and the peasant has a mighty respect for the ability to read and write—comes to his village and whips up the ever-latent fires of fanaticism is the peasant a dangerous man; otherwise “live and let live” is his motto.

This is the type of man, working hard on the poor soil for a frugal living, scratching at the outcropping rocks for mere existence, who has been pauperized and driven desperate by the savage collective fining so popular with the Palestine Government. In a good year there is very little surplus for the Arab farmer; in a bad year waists are slim and belts drawn tight. Most of them

are in the grip of effendi money-lenders with notes against them bearing interest at three to seven hundred per cent, and many of them have been imprisoned at some time or another for failure to pay taxes. When fines come along their position is quite hopeless. In desperation, driven by the poverty and hunger of their women and children, it is not surprising if, utterly destitute, with naught to lose but their lives, they take to the hills and swell the bands who are fighting such seemingly hopeless odds of aeroplanes, armoured cars, trained soldiers, and machine-guns. The very existence of these bands is a sign that the Arab is savagely desperate. He is too much of a realist to fight when he sees little chance of winning. Only the fact that he has nothing more to lose keeps him in the sub-war, for his one remaining hope is to expel the British, and so win a little peace. He does not surrender in these days; the gallows at Jerusalem or Acre wait for him if he does not care to die fighting.

Finally, this seems to be the position. The British military, driven by the pressure of the Empire's need, are attempting the impossible. All that they can hope to do is to overawe the Arab so that if a major war starts, as it may at any moment, Palestine will be prostrate in terror-stricken subjection. Both the soldier and the Arab know that this is hopeless. Hatred is growing with every day that passes, with every house blown up, with every spine snapped in the British noose, with every miserable stick of furniture sold forcibly to pay collective fines.* Britain has abandoned any idea of ever making a happy people in Palestine or of successfully executing her mandate. She is determined to leave, and only her strategical and imperial needs are keeping her there.

The Jews look with apprehension to the future. With great justification they feel that they have been betrayed. The area of the national home has been whittled down, their hopes of a permanent *rapprochement* with their Arab neighbours are for ever gone. Even a year ago

* Recently when the village of Tiyebeh, near Tulkram on the coastal plain, was fined, the whole population evacuated it, taking away their few poor sticks and tools, and fled to Jaffa.

there was still hope of final peace. Now there is none. If the Jews ever wish to restore Israel they must fight desperately hard for very existence and hang on in desperation until the fact that they were once British protégées is forgotten with the passage of time. The Arab—well, they have seen conquerors come and they have watched them go. This is no new tale to them. They feel that when the dust has settled, when the fight is over, they will still be there, with only the shells of splintered houses and a few more grave-mounds above hanged and shot brethren to tell the story.

Finally we come to the great question which concerns every one of us—the holy places? Are they safe? And to that the answer is, as the Arabs say, "*Inshallah*", which means, "That is as God wills"; humanly speaking, they appear to be in a more precarious position than ever they have been in their long and perilous history. No man can make a guess at the future of Outremer; even the immediate future is too clouded by a host of possible and probable events. The present is dreary enough—a welter of ambushes, murder, desperation, tyranny, hope for ever deferred and trusts shamefully betrayed, good men on all three sides fanatically certain that their own course of action is just and proper, and all full of that ancient poison, summed up in the words of Scripture, to the effect that men honestly believe they do God service by killing their opponents.

The strife of nations, the clash of ideologies, the war between democracy and autocracy, are finding a deadly theatre in the holy land of Palestine—the only hope for the country which saw the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose crops and produce nourished His earthly Body, is that peace may speedily come to the peoples of the West and the East, and then the tension will ease. With Britain's withdrawal, after a period of administration which might have been one of the most glorious in our annals (and which will, probably, be as carefully slurred over in school text-books as the first years of Henry VI when the French provinces were lost), one of the interested parties will be gone, and maybe, though there seems little likelihood at the moment, Arab

Semites and Hebrew Semites will work out a *modus vivendi*. A slender hope, but all now remaining of one of the fairest dreams man has conceived since our forefathers marched east and south with the cry "Save us, Holy Sepulchre" on their lips, and the prayers of the Angelus composed on the line of march as their consolation.

DOUGLAS V. DUFF.

GARGOYLES

'These Satyrs taken in mid-leer,
Struck in the changing of a wind,
These Pans with stale arrested sneer
These, stiffened in their stony rind
With cramp of seven centuries,
Praise God with fossil blasphemies.

But when their crusted circumstance
Thaws in a dawn of trumpetings,
And float in strange deliverance
Grave angels upon graven wings,
A smoke of goatish breath will out
From pinnacle and water-spout.

Then crooked arm and hairy shank
Will tingle, that had gone to sleep,
And shaggy haunch and gleaming flank
Will stretch and straighten, till they leap
Out of their penitential trance
To praise Him with Arcadian dance.

Till up and down the tilted roof
On alp and avalanche of lead
The mountaineers with flying hoof
Shall stamp the hollow water-shed,
Bellowing as they come and go,
"*Laus et Jubilatio.*"

GERALD CROW.

LEO XIII

ON 1 January, 1838, the priest Joachim Vincent Pecci, Leo XIII to be, said his first mass in the church of St. Andrea al Quirinale, and the note of the centenary in the current newspapers has been a sudden reminder to many readers not only of their own advance into middle age but of the fact that yet another contemporary figure is passing into history. It is, in fact, almost thirty-five years since Leo XIII died, and just sixty since his election. Of those who served in high office during his reign scarce one survives. Rampolla died on the eve of the war, Merry del Val lived on to see the Lateran Treaties. One cardinal alone of the distinguished college Leo created is still with us, the one-time Primate of Bohemia, the aged invalid Cardinal Skrbenski.

The world is apt to judge those in high places by what is generally said about them—by what is systematically shouted, might be truer—in the headlines of the Press, the clichés and slogan-phrased generalities of the personal paragraph, the leading article and the obituary notice. And, of course, the fashion is too universal for Catholics not to be affected, even where Catholic matters are in question. The glory and virtue of a pope are, only too often, popularly eclipsed by the reaction that his successor's (imagined) contrary virtues let loose, and no one is to be capable of sympathizing simultaneously with Pius IX and Leo XIII, or with Leo and Pius X.

There is no doubt that the unusual brilliancy of Leo's achievement was followed by a period when he suffered undue depreciation. Very unfairly there was laid to his charge that he had failed to scotch what was only mature enough to be scotched in the reign of his successor. Again the contrast between the diplomatic successes possible in his time and the succession of breaches of contact that marked the short reign of Pius X was only too often unfairly exploited against his memory by a facile distinction between "the diplomat" and "the saint".

In the twenty-five years since Pius X died much has changed, and not the least striking feature of the present great pontificate is the continual reference to Leo XIII,

to his principles of action, to his writings, to his acts. Pius XI, indeed, never tires of citing his great predecessor, and, in many respects, the writer pays him the greatest of compliments who hails him as the heir to Leo, the one appointed to fulfil all the earlier pope's promise.

Ecclesia ingemuit, complorante orbe universo is inscribed on Leo's tomb, and truly enough, the disappearance in July 1903 of this frail, ancient figure, ninety-three years of age—the longest lived, save one, of all the two hundred and sixty popes—who for a quarter of a century had ruled the Church, bringing it in that time from a situation where it was little more than the butt of statesmen and publicists to be once more a real force in the life of the world, the passing of Leo XIII had about it something of catastrophe. It was one of those events upon which there follows a great silence, when for a moment all humanity holds its breath and comment is forborne, rendered indeed impossible.

Many of the circumstances of Leo XIII's ordination recall that, by his origins and his early career, he belonged to an age that, to us, is as remote as the Middle Ages. He was, for example, already a Domestic Prelate when, in December 1837, he came to the end of his long scrupulous hesitation and sought Holy Orders. His studies, prolonged several years beyond the normal, had ended in the previous January, and he had received his prelacy with his first appointment as one of the advocates at the supreme tribunal of the Segnatura. He had been a student at the then highly privileged Academy for Noble Ecclesiastics, and he was already personally known to the learned old pope Gregory XVI. It was only after something of a struggle that he had obtained admission to this *hortus conclusus*, for his family, the Pecci, though lords of the little town of Carpineto where the future pope was born, had neglected somewhat the necessary continuous insistence on their noble blood. The young ecclesiastic had to write a summary history of his house to prove his right.

Mgr. Pecci, about to enter the temporal administration of the Papal States, the upper branch of its Civil Service as we might say, was, professionally, a canonist

rather than a theologian, and, by personal taste and the excellent training of his Jesuit schoolmasters, already a finished Latinist with something more than a flair for composition in verse. His family was poor if noble, and the young ecclesiastic had been glad to earn his six crowns a month as a private tutor in the Collegio Germanico while he pursued his own higher studies.

It was a change of unusual rapidity then which, within a few weeks of his ordination, saw Joachim Pecci named delegate for Benevento, that is to say the supreme civil ruler, under the pope, of the city and the surrounding enclave, a tiny island of papal territory hemmed in on all sides by the kingdom of Naples. The situation here called for a knowledge of more than canon law. There were brigands—unusually well circumstanced given the political geography of the region—and Liberals and *carbonari*. It was the unhappy reign of Gregory XVI, with Metternich administered *incompetentemente assai* to the pope's subjects, a world of grievances economic, social and political—the greatest grievance being, as Consalvi had noted, the fact of an absolute government where all the officers were ecclesiastics. Of all this discontent Benevento—remember once more the political geography—was a hot-bed. There had been a serious revolt eight years earlier and the fires were still hot beneath the ash.

Also there was the Cardinal-Archbishop of Benevento who, traditionally, had little use for Monsignore the Delegato, and there was a certain Avvocato Palomba who had usurped all manner of prestige, and even the Delegate's very palace, and who must be considered because he was the special protégé of Cardinal Gamberini, and, after all, this was Joachim Pecci's first independent appointment, court favour counted for much, and he was only twenty-eight.

Benevento was a foreshadowing in little of what, forty years and more later, the pontificate of Leo XIII was to be, in the nature of the problem and the gifts its solution called for.

Joachim Pecci made a success of the Benevento appointment and after three years of it he was sent to govern Perugia. Then, in 1843, he received the unusual

promotion of a transfer to the diplomatic service and to ambassadorial rank, named as nuncio to Belgium and appointed Archbishop of Damietta. He was still some weeks short of thirty-three.

The career, so far, had been as brilliant as its experiences were varied. The youthful prelate had had good patrons. He had been well protected and skilfully advanced, but in every post real ability and a gift for continuous hard work had justified all that had been done for him. The nunciature at Brussels was to introduce a new, maturing note into the business of Pecci's life and to prove a turning-point. The Belgian kingdom, fruit of a revolution where Catholics and Liberals co-operated, was but thirteen years old. The king, Victoria's "Uncle Leopold", was not a Catholic, and in 1843 the ministry was Liberal and the alliance with the Catholics already at an end. In a conflict between the government and the hierarchy on a question of elementary education the nuncio supported the bishops, and successfully used his influence with Leopold to defeat the government. From this moment his fate as nuncio was settled. The king, in private letters to Rome, hinted at Pecci's youth and its inevitable rashness, and the Austrian Ambassador at Brussels wrote in somewhat the same sense to Vienna, a letter meant to be communicated to Rome and which, through the nuncio at Vienna, was communicated to Rome, with no unmeaning glosses on the original text. In the winter of 1845 the thing was decided. Perugia had just lost its bishop, there was already a movement calling for Mgr. Pecci to succeed him, and so he should return as bishop to the city that had known him as its civil ruler, transferred now from the diplomatic career to the pastoral as unexpectedly as he had been transferred to it from the civil administration.

He left Belgium on 2 May, 1846. A month later Gregory XVI died. Pius IX was elected on 16 June and on 26 July the new bishop made his solemn entry into Perugia, in distinguished official semi-disgrace. At Perugia the Archbishop-Bishop remained for thirty years, while at Rome a new Pharaoh reigned who knew not Joseph. Mgr. Pecci had been promised, in 1846, that his

appointment should count as though it were promotion to a nunciature of the first class, and in 1853, accordingly, the red hat came to him. But to the great world of the Curia he was for a whole generation little more than a name. He passed into middle age, to the full maturity of his powers, and thence into old age itself and then, in 1876, the all-powerful Cardinal Antonelli died who had been, if not his enemy, a chief barrier to his influence, and in 1877 Pius IX named him Cardinal Camerlengo. When, and if, a vacancy came in the Apostolic See, it would fall to Cardinal Pecci to govern during the interregnum and to make the arrangements for the conclave.

The event was not long delayed. Pius IX died on 7 February, 1878, and on 20 February, after an unusually short conclave, the Bishop of Perugia, who had been from the beginning the only serious candidate, was elected at the third ballot, with 44 votes out of 61. He had seen his fate approaching and, while the final vote was in progress, made his way to Cardinal Bartolini, whom he guessed had largely influenced the undecided voters. "Cardinal," he is reported to have said, "since they really want me to be Pope I have no desire to oppose God's will in the matter, but the whole responsibility for this election is on your shoulders. It is to God that you must answer for that."

He was, by eighteen days, just sixty-eight years old. For six years he had governed men in temporal matters, for three he had lived with statesmen, diplomatists and politicians, for thirty he had been the ordinary of a small Italian diocese. It was in this last long period of obscurity that the man had ripened, discovering new gifts of patience, penetration and prudence, and acquiring a first-hand familiarity with the thought of the greatest of Christian thinkers, St. Thomas Aquinas. From Perugia, to whoever was interested to notice them, had come forth a series of pastoral letters—directions for the faithful people on all the burning politico-ecclesiastical questions of the day—that were unique in their combination of grasp of principle and sense of the realities of things. He had reorganized his diocese, created a seminary which was a model for the quality of the formation

it gave and, in the great provincial council of 1869, he had been the chief inspiration of a renewal of ecclesiastical life that left no diocese of Umbria and the Marches untouched. The tall old man, delicate and frail, reserved and dispassionate, icy, even, in his aloofness, who now as Leo XIII was to rule for twenty-five years, was such a miracle of political prudence and the diplomatic gifts as the Church had rarely seen among the popes since Alessandro Farnese, Pope Paul III.

The Catholic powers, whom the last years of Pius IX's long and tragic reign had seen estranged from the Holy See, were won back little by little. Catholicism was dissociated from Carlism in Spain and from royalism in France. In Germany the long night of the *Kulturkampf* gradually lightened. Everywhere the bitter domestic dissensions between "liberal" Catholics and "ultramontanes", which had for half a century torn and rended the Church, began to be healed under this new pope, the unifying note of whose complex world-wide action was that the Church must be in the world if it is to fulfil its mission of saving the world, that it must understand the speech of the world and itself speak in an idiom the world can understand.

The weakness of the Catholicism of what the French call the Restoration, of the generation of Leo XIII's youth, had lain in the poverty of its thought. It was an age of humanists and rhetoricians, and one of its most brilliant representatives, our own Cardinal Wiseman, had been able to speak, as though he were describing the further side of the moon, of "the crabbed metaphysics of the school", while in the Roman schools St. Thomas Aquinas owed what reference was ever made to him to the fact of his being a saint, rather than to any understanding of the value of his thought.

We are still too close to Leo XIII to see the scale of all he did and the due proportion and relation of one part to another, but there seems little doubt but that history will support the judgement of Pius XI that for his restoration of Scholasticism alone he deserves to be placed among the greatest of all the popes, and Leo's latest biographer has been able to write the story of his reign

in terms of this fundamental work. The encyclical *Aeterni Patris* which inaugurated it was one of his first acts (4 August, 1879) and one of the most personal. With it must be recalled his vigorous action to force the reform on the none too willing professors at Louvain, his foundation there of the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie Thomiste and his never failing support for its first president, Mgr. Mercier. The Gregorian University was reformed in a similar sense and a new Catholic University founded at Fribourg. No one, so far, has studied the policy of Leo as it affected the development of the Canon Law during his long reign, but the encouragement given to critical studies by the opening to scholars of the Vatican Archives in 1881, and by such cardinalitial creations as that of Newman (in the teeth of opposition, as we now know, from the "old guard"), is well known, and it is only now that we begin to reap its fruits. The study of Sacred Scripture is another branch of sacred learning which owes much for its present development to Leo XIII. The great encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (18 November, 1893) and the foundation of the Biblical Commission are signs of the Pope's understanding of his own age no less eloquent than *Rerum Novarum*.

Constitutional history is rarely spectacular. The slow transformation of the spirit of a complicated administration, the evolution of new types of officials to serve it, and of new types of subjects in consequence, these are changes that in the nature of things can rarely be perceived, still less appreciated truly, by contemporaries. One great English daily, in a kind of panegyric of Pius X, had to make, regretfully, one or two reservations in its tribute. There was his "grandmotherly interference in the petty details of the lives of his flock", and the instance chosen to illustrate this was the new rule about the age for first communion!

Leo XIII met the problems of the immediate hour with a new freshness of judgement, and, not unsuccessfully, very courageously, essayed new methods to solve them. Yet not these, nor the achievement of the men he had formed and whom he used to carry out his policies—

Czacki and Ferrata in France, Jacobini and Rampolla at the Secretariate of State, Galimberti in Germany and Austria, and the rest—will be his final title to an eminent share in posterity's gratitude, but the foresight with which he dealt with the problems that are ultimate, that never are solved, but are always with us. The work done for the exposition of Christian truth in his great encyclicals, and in the renaissance of Catholic intellectual life which he so fostered, is one evidence of this care for the ultimate values, and his continual reliance on prayer and exhortation to prayer is another.

Few popes indeed have done more, by direct personal action on the whole Church, to promote Prayer and Devotion. There are, for example, the two classic encyclicals on the Holy Ghost (*Divinum Illud Munus*) and the Holy Eucharist (*Mirae Charitatis*), those on the most Holy Redeemer, on Our Lady, St. Joseph and the Holy Family, and on prayer for the souls in Purgatory. There is the letter announcing the consecration of the whole human race to the Sacred Heart, which Leo spoke of as the greatest act of his reign. There are the Jubilees. Above all there is the preaching, that never ceased, of the devotion of the Holy Rosary. To promote this popular devotion, and to unite Catholics everywhere through the Rosary with his own great needs, Leo XIII wrote no fewer than nine encyclical letters. Here, in fact, in his reliance on the Rosary said by his faithful people throughout the world, is the very heart of Leo XIII. If what is done for the spiritual formation of the flock be any test of the shepherd, Leo XIII must be placed among the very best.

It still remains true that the world judges more superficially, and that it is by the more spectacular and more easily measured achievement of what is done through human activities (*lege* diplomacy) to defend the very existence of the Church as a Church, its function and rights as the director of men's souls, and the rights of men to follow the direction, that popes are often wholly judged. And in two matters, each of immense complexity, Leo XIII was judged less than fairly by contemporaries, and has perhaps not been justly appreci-

ated by posterity. These are his policy of rallying the Catholics of France to the Third Republic, and his intransigent handling of the problem of the Holy See's relations with Italy. And yet, here too, political genius of the highest order is more and more seen to have been at work. In the Pope's care to disengage the spiritual from any real union with the temporal were laid the bases of that freedom which enabled Pius X to be certain of the obedience of France in the crisis of 1906. The breach with the Third Republic was preparing through all the last years of Leo's time. When it came, it came, thanks to his policy, with no complication of alleged necessary Catholic disloyalty to the Republic to embitter the separation.

In Italy, too, Leo XIII saved the future both for Italy and for Catholicism in Italy. When the moment for an understanding came, it found the Church, here too, with its hands free from any political entanglement, with no memories of compromise with principle to shackle its action, and this thanks to the policy initiated by the first Pope to be a "prisoner" from his election, and faithfully adhered to by his successors.

The great Pope was much more than a statesman, and in his verse the best of the natural in him met the supernatural. The last two of his poems he wrote in the first days of his last illness. Here is the more personal of them :

NOCTURNA INGEMESCENTIS ANIMAE MEDITATIO

Fatalis ruit hora, Leo ; jam tempus abire est,
 Pro meritisque viam carpere perpetuam.
 Quae te sors maneat ? Coelum sperare jubebant
 Largus contulerat quae tibi dona Deus ;
 At summae claves, immenso pondere munus
 Tot tibi gestum annos, haec meditare gemens :
 Qui namque in populis excelso praestat honore,
 Hei misero, poenas acrius inde luet.
 Haec inter trepido dulcis succurrit imago,
 Dulcior atque animo vox sonat alloquii :
 Quid te tanta premit formido ? Aevique peracti
 Quid seriem repentens, tristia corde foves ?
 Christus adest miserans : humili veniamque roganti
 Erratum, ah ! fidas, eluet omne tibi.

PHILIP HUGHES.

URBS ET ORBS

- The Power and the Secret of the Papacy.* By Fülöp Müller. Translated by C. M. R. Bonacina. (Longmans, 1937. Pp. 202. 7s. 6d.)
- Pius XI.* By P. Hughes. (Sheed & Ward, 1937. Pp. x, 318. 8s. 6d. net.)
- Pope Pius XI and World Peace.* By Lord Clonmore. (R. Hale, 1937. Pp. xiv, 306. 12s. 6d. net.)
- The Life and Work of Pius XI; the Pope in Politics.* By W. Teeling. (Lovat Dickson, 1937. Pp. viii, 294. 7s. 6s. net.)

IT is not surprising that there should be at present a spate of books about Pope Pius XI and, indeed, about the Papacy as such, and this perhaps because of the constant suppression or distortion of Catholic news in the Press, just at the moment when so many are perceiving that the Church stands for something unique about which men would increasingly like to know. This is not only because the Pope is being realized as by far the most remarkable man in Europe at present—certainly more remarkable by far than any of the three dictators who admit notoriety (Salazar, if he can be called a dictator, does his work quietly and without rhetoric), but because in so chaotic a world any authoritative system is of interest, and everyone knows that the Pope is authoritarian personally, and represents a system of some authoritative sort. But it is also known that this system (whatever it be) certainly is not identical with Fascism, Nazi-ism, or Russian "ideology" (to use a hateful word), and has, in fact, suffered much from all three, and in short, that the option between Fascism and Communism, constantly set before the working-man, is not a true dichotomy. Though there are those still bold enough to use the word "democracy", they do not regard this as anything so definite or trustworthy as to be a true third along with Fascism and Communism, and even doubt (as the present writer does) whether there really is any anywhere. So they want to know what "papalism" is, and are astonished to find that they have the thing at work beneath their very eyes, and need not hark back to books about the middle ages, the renaissance, or even 1870.

Further, the mere fact that from time to time they do hear something of what is happening to the Church, and know that it is being attacked in many parts of the world, helps them to realize that it is an international fact and force, or better, super-national, and that it is, and always has been, what the earlier Communist system proclaimed as its ideal; "earlier", because in Russia Communism is drawing in its internationalist horns, save in so far, of course, as it implements revolution where it can; and again, that "Vaticanism" differs to some extent according to national temperament, yet is not committed to any one nation rather than another, or even race, and that it combats the German myth of racialism and to some extent at least Italian nationalism, though Germany (or, at least, Hitler, or his managers) declares herself "imperialist" only through necessity, while the Duce, I fancy, really does envisage a new Roman Empire with himself for Cæsar. I doubt if Herr Hitler "pictures" *himself* as anything in particular in the Germany of the future. The Church's ideal, therefore, is a more obvious defiance to the German one, than to the Duce's vision.

But men know too, by now, that the Church claims as much as, or more than, anyone to govern also minds and even consciences. One element that the English most dislike in the Fascist or Nazi systems as they exist, is, precisely, their claim to create a mental one-way traffic, so that all citizens shall think what the State does, or, at least, not express their thoughts if they don't. Hence their use of force at all points, which the Pope neither does nor can use. It is quaint that the only free newspaper in Italy is the *Osservatore Romano*. Yet increasingly men know that the Catholic religion, while it contains "mysticism" (not but what people are ready to use that much *misused* word to describe any belief in spiritual things), possesses also a system of philosophy so rigid as to have been called rationalist. Here, again, it is more akin to the logical Latin mind, than to the turbid German mind (contrast Calvin with Luther). It has well been said that the Germans do not cohere without (i) extreme pressure being brought to bear on them, and (ii) a

myth of some sort to fascinate them. While as for the Russians, Berdyaev has quoted the already remote insurgent Belinsky: "I become terrible when I get some mystical absurdity into my head," and he agrees that the Russian in general is apt to suffer thus. Hence, maybe, the power of the Jew in Russia. He, too, is "Messianic", and so can appreciate yet stereotype that Russian visionariness, for he calculates, and becomes ruthless chiefly in so far as he escapes from a persecuting force, which he has not had to do amongst ourselves, though heaven knows what he *will* do when the reaction comes in Germany.

Of the four books sent to us, Dr. Fülöp Müller's should be read first, because it concerns the Papacy rather than the reigning Pontiff to whom but a few pages are consecrated. We say at once that it is far better than his scrupulously studious book upon the Jesuits, if only because his scholarship has matured, the period he takes is shorter (Pius IX—sketched lightly—to the present day, the Popes who have followed Leo XIII being sketched no less lightly), and within it he studies principles rather than detailed application. Yet he has not lost his dramatic sense. The book opens with a really amusing contrast between the Vatican Council and the Anti-Council of Freethinkers which assembled simultaneously at Naples. Its job was to smash not only the Vatican but the Faith itself, and, indeed, belief in God, "source and fulcrum of every despotism and wickedness". This unfortunate Anti-Council proceeded from banalities to "furious wrangling"; no resolution could be arrived at; the Neapolitan hotel-keepers finally refused to harbour any of its uproarious participants. Unluckily, the author, in his desire to point the contrast, is right in his view of the supernatural *aim* of the Council, but misses (it seems to me) the whole point of the first definitions *de Deo*, which insist on the power of reason, as such, to achieve with certainty a knowledge that God exists, and much about His nature and man's destiny. He stresses the "conflict between a faith that rests on spiritual experience, on mystical intuition, and on transmitted, authoritative revelation, and rational thinking, which

endeavours to press forward to truth entirely by its own powers" (p. 9); "in all these pronouncements . . . there comes to life the old belief of primitive Christianity that faith alone is the sure basis of cognition, and that rational speculation is a temptation of the devil" (p. 64). This defies St. Paul, the forceful use by St. John of the category "logus", and the earlier apologists, of whom Tertullian (whom he quotes so much) is not characteristic. The result is that the brilliant pages devoted to the resistance of the "modern" papacy to the philosophers of the Enlightenment is not a little lop-sided, he does not clearly see the difference between reason and rationalism (not but what the consistent condemnation by Rome of the Catholic would-be orthodox "Kantians" in the wide sense ought to have puzzled him), and we feel that unconsciously he wants to dramatize the contrast between Pius IX, angrily barking out curses from his arm-chair, if not his very death-bed, and Leo XIII on whom, from p. 37, he concentrates. He has rendered very great service, however, by his unflinching exhibition of the true, atheistic, and violently persecuting nature of foreign Freemasonry, e.g., pp. 26, 51, 97-102, 113. This is on the whole but alluded to in the other books, because, no doubt, Freemasonry is said to be a spent force in modern Italy and even France, though we doubt it.*

The account of Pecci's nunciature at Brussels (he was twenty-three!) is interesting, since it exhibits him as a failure, described as "passive, without initiative, without authority, and wholly without adaptability" (p. 55); none the less, he was experiencing at first hand and for the first time mechanical developments, and could foresee the social problem. He had also been a careerist, anxious to exalt his family by progress in the prelacy (p. 53). But as bishop of Perugia he began to display, in obscurity, the talents which shone so brilliantly

* We said: "Foreign Masonry", since it is always urged that this has differed substantially from the British version. This again we doubt, in this sense, that we have watched it—in prisoners' camps; in the mercantile marine; in the Burmese forestry; in the army; in the Press; in universities—even those proudest of their antiquity and intellectual detachment—operating as a secret, grossly unfair, unscrupulous, and all-but coercive force. This opinion is shared, I think, by more than usually admit to it, and is unpopular for that and other reasons.

in him as Pope—a long preface of obedience and subordination such as the reigning Pontiff declares is essential for one who is to rule. In 1878, he was elected Supreme Pontiff.

It is here that the author attacks his real subject. The "Power and the Secret of the Papacy" is due to the fact that it and it alone, especially in the modern world, is possessed of absolutely immutable principles, combined with a marvellous flexibility. The second "secret", I think, is the Church's sense of hierarchy, not only within herself, but throughout the universe, herself within it; and she seeks to form that harmony among differentials which exists but so imperfectly.

The author rightly begins by discussing the restoration of Thomism—anyhow, of Aquinas—to honour, which Leo began to effect only a year after his accession. I am practically certain that Dr. Fülöp Müller does not grasp the difference between natural and revealed religion, and, within the latter, the nature of "mystery" technically so-named, nor the Church's immemorial doctrine as to the mind's reaction to the three possible sorts of truth presented to it, and this, despite what is written on pp. 69 and 71. This hardly matters, for he sees in what sense Leo saw that "looseness of opinion" creates not only personal and social disorder, but ends in universal scepticism, so that reason commits suicide (p. 180). One may say that his own commentary on the states of mind which respectively derided and accepted *Aeterni Patris* and the endeavour to reintroduce a mediaeval system into the modern world is better than his account of that system itself (pp. 166–182). He puts so strong a case against the applicability of Aquinas to our time, that we think at first that he is propounding, for once, his own opinion, but, after all, he ends by recognizing that the mind *can* know truth—fact; that there can be an entelechy in things, and must be, if they are to have either meaning or value. And he gives evidence of the reaction towards this conclusion provided by men of science themselves.

The author devotes the rest of his book, inevitably, to the effect of rationalism and the denial of absolute

truth, and again of "entelechy", in the realms of the State and of Social Justice in particular. He considers Leo to have "learned from" Aquinas that in its sphere the State was as perfect and autonomous a society as, in *its* sphere, the Church was. Hence a totally new attitude of the Vatican in regard of existing States, involving, incidentally, the rejection of the mediaeval doctrine of the two Swords. But here again, the contrast between the times of "Tertullian and Augustine"—not to mention Boniface VIII—is far too violent. The dichotomy had been declared by Christ in His phrase about God and Cæsar, emphasized by St. Paul and St. Peter, reiterated by the apologists, and formulated at least from Gelasius onwards till it became incarnated in that Canon Law which was the basis of all our own Law and had its echo even in America when our exiles went there (and, indeed, still does, inasmuch as President Roosevelt studies encyclicals . . .). Quotations from Maitland, Carlyle, Gierke, and so on, could be multiplied. The theory, in fact, has always been luminous, its application in cases of "mixed jurisdiction" provides the obscurities. However, exactly in proportion as the idea of the State Almighty has prevailed in Europe—"in two directions", wrote Bismarck, "the new German Empire must categorically renounce all the traditions of the old, it has nothing to do with hierarchical or theocratic, nothing with cosmopolitan tendencies. It is a secular, national State"—all ecclesiastical authority had to be so far as possible eliminated. Once, the Cæsar was *also* God, now he is Cæsar, and there *is* no God, or, at least, "God's in His heaven", and shall not interfere with the world, not even if all's wrong with it. In the past generation, nationalisms could appeal desperately to the defined doctrine of papal infallibility, which the author interprets awry, almost as Gladstone and Bismarck did. The Vatican Council proclaimed the Pope possessed "of autocratic powers over the whole Church" (p. 92 and see p. 87). The Pope has now a "position of absolute authority within the Church, the collective episcopate of the world" is "subordinate to him", as Bismarck said: "The Bishops are now only his instru-

ments, his officials without personal authority . . . (he is) a sovereign . . . completely absolute, more so than any absolute monarch in the world". Well, after but a few years, Leo was decorating Bismarck with the Order of Christ, and was manifestly preparing the way for the restoration of the "temporal independence" of the Holy See—a plan which went incredibly near success, but was wrecked at the last moment by—it was impartially said—the Masons or the Jesuits. But it is noticeable that hardly anything (unless I err) is substantial in the Lateran treaty and concordat which was not explicitly considered between Leo and Crispi's government.

Dr. Fülöp Müller, then, is perfectly right in singling out as essential the Intellectual Order which Leo sought to restore. Where it has collapsed, the social order will in its turn collapse. The State will be secularized and seek to be almighty, but, meanwhile, will be unable to resist unscrupulous finance, and so, class-hatred will be engineered, the masses will be miserable, revolutions will become normal, and the human race will return "to the jungle and the cave". The absolute consistency of papal thought from Leo through Pius X and Benedict (a very great Pope, outdazzled by the war, but destined to win, we trust, his proper crown from history), to Pius XI is certainly the most astounding phenomenon in a world which everywhere else is "loose" or arbitrary.

That the author has made this clear, and that he has read so much, and been so honest, makes us forgive him his many inaccuracies, which might perhaps have been avoided had he gone through a strict course of training for two years, even in a Catholic university.

Of Fr. Hughes's book we can say comprehensively that it could not be bettered. Its list of pontifical sources (pp. 315-318) is admirably marshalled and elucidated (pp. ix, x). At first, you think the book will be all too scholarly wan, but no, there is, here and there, a real, fervent, always dignified rhetoric—as on pp. 57, 58, about the years of Italy's "spiritual twilight"; pp. 98, 99, about the epic of Poland's salvation; p. 106, the Election. Perhaps, paradoxically, what seems

most valuable is the pre-papal career of the future Pontiff. Never have we so clearly appreciated his work in the Ambrosian library, where first we met him, and can recall the absolute calm and decisiveness, with which Mgr. Ratti told us exactly what we wanted to know, found us our manuscripts, all with the maximum of courtesy and the minimum expenditure of time. As for the Polish episode, it is appalling that historians have hardly attended to it at all. Our biassed but also sentimental Press remembers that the Pope climbed Alps, but not, that he was manifestly the first statesman in Europe or the world. When you compare him, as diplomat, with those of Versailles, you really feel as though, in another sphere, you were forced to compare him, as teacher, with Anglican archbishops. It is impossible here to describe the excellent pages, especially 220, which explain the Lateran treaty and concordat, they display the utter falsity of the allegation that the Pope has gone fascist, and the paragraphs dealing with Abyssinia are perfectly balanced. I cannot but once more allude to the iniquity of our British Press, which, in papal matters, as in what concerns, e.g., Spain or Mexico, has entered into a "conspiracy of silence" quite as bad as direct falsification of news (see e.g. pp. 294, 308). I think that this book ought also to show us our vague-minded yet tenacious people what being an "Italian" can mean, at any rate, a northern Italian. The Pope is extremely Italian, which means, he can "organize his thoughts" (p. 101), is realist, and also idealist, has a caustic humour, and an infinite *bontà*; spoke of his brief Cardinalate as not only a "gesture of sovereign courtesy to the noble Polish nation, lately risen from the dead", but also "to my own dear city and diocese of Milan"—words which Cardinal Hinsley all but quoted, in regard of England, when alluding to his own en-scarletting. In short, the Westminster Archivist has exhibited not only the personal character of this Italian Pope, and the universal mind needed by one who is now a Roman, but the amazing thoroughness of all that the Church does, her exactness, her abomination (despite the *stylus Curiae*, undoubtedly orotund) for meaningless phrases—

her total unlikeness, in fine, for all to which the Church here Established so lamentably accustoms us.

I have now no space for describing Lord Clonmore's book or Mr. Teeling's. The former covers much the same ground as Fr. Hughes's, concentrates on the Pope as intensely concerned with *peace*, leaves us bewildered as to why politicians always strain after every method of ensuring peace which has never been any particular use, while neglecting those far shrewder as well as more spiritual principles which are proper to the Church. If they do not hate, they disregard the only force which, given its chance, could bring order into our appalling chaos. There is a sort of boyish colloquialism about Lord Clonmore's style, which you thoroughly enjoy if you know him, but which might seem too happy-go-lucky (for this subject) if you don't. Since, I suppose, more people don't know a man, than do, we think, on the whole, that his book might have gained by "a bit" more sobersidedness.

We frankly regret Mr. Teeling's book, the more so because his work on housing was so promising, and he provided so much first-hand study of his subject. We had hoped much, too, from his visits to Australia and New Zealand, but were disappointed. This book, as a whole, is written very carelessly and in "journallese", and he seems to have thought he could assimilate the world as quickly as he did the depressed areas. He has, too, the air of having been huffed because the Pope kept him waiting for an audience, did not seem sufficiently interested in what his visitor had to say, and even seemed rather in a bad temper. Perhaps he was. Mr. Teeling is convinced that the Pope is afraid of democracies, and therefore of the United States in particular, and hatches the astonishing notion that he is so eager to see the East reunited with Rome because he feels that a strong Catholic orient would counter-balance North America. . . . Japan, again, is apparently studying papal infallibility, because that would be a useful yet not exorbitant prerogative for the Mikado. What, to me, is rather galling, is the author's conviction that he is being bold, and airing views that needed expression, but that his

fellow-Catholics did not dare to utter. In reality, all such topics are freely discussed, but with more knowledge, and if anyone wants to find the requisite material in the proper perspective, e.g., as to Catholic Action, which Mr. Teeling quite misconceives along, I suppose, with all non-Catholics who have not gone to the sources and even some Catholics who do not want to do what Mr. Teeling calls "shoving one's religion down people's throats"—he will find it in Lord Clonmore's quite balanced book, and, with greater authority, in Fr. Hughes's.

We put these books down feeling more than ever convinced of how extraordinary a phenomenon is the Roman Church even from a human standpoint, amazed once more that statesmen do not perceive this, and by no means amazed that all who wish to destroy religion concentrate precisely upon Rome.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

THE UNIVERSITY OF COIMBRA

*Se Coimbra fôsse minha
Como é dos estudantes . . .
Mandara-lhe pôr no meio
Um vaso de diamantes !*

COIMBRA, the Oxford of Portugal, has been celebrating four centuries of university history. It is a charming city, rising steeply terraced from the Mondego to be crowned by the University buildings, in ambient no less than in tradition the perfect setting for the academic life. Though now but the fifth city in the land, it was once the capital; till a generation ago it was the only university. The hey-day of Portuguese greatness in the sixteenth century was also that of Coimbra, and the nation's cultural history is to be traced there, step by step, better than anywhere else. What intellectual movements of national significance have not originated within its classrooms have originated, by reaction, without, but still in Coimbra; an anthology of the poetry it has inspired* contains, almost without exception, every major name in the annals of the country's muse; and the present premier, Dr. Salazar, is testimony to the contribution it still has to make to national affairs.

The year 1537 marks merely the final establishment, not the founding, of the University in Coimbra. Before then it had already enjoyed a peripatetic existence extending over two centuries and a half, that ranks it among the oldest in Europe and in the Peninsula second only to Salamanca. The story of those early perambulations is linked closely to the names of two kings of the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, as its later history is linked pre-eminently with the name of a great statesman of the eighteenth. D. Diniz (1279-1325), the founder, was the first monarch to inherit the full national territory. The Reconquest, a mere interlude of a hundred and fifty years as compared with Spain's eight centuries, was over, and the achievement preluded the Golden Age of mediaeval

* *Cancioneiro de Coimbra*. Ed. A. Lopes Vieira, Coimbra, 1918.

Portugal, in which D. Diniz himself played a notable part. Patron of learning and man of letters, it was in 1288 that he conferred with prelates of the Church concerning the founding of a centre of higher education, which the latter would help to endow. The obtaining of papal authorization caused some delay, but on March 1, 1290, the first "Estudo Geral" was instituted in Lisbon.

The venture was not entirely propitious. Lisbon was already a bustling metropolis and port, and its distractions proved a heady wine to those *in statu pupillari*. For eighteen years the University was a source of growing annoyance to the townspeople and disappointment to the monarch. In 1308 he caused it to be transferred to Coimbra, in part doubtless as compensation for the hurt inflicted on the city when, half a century earlier, it had ceased to be the capital, but much more because of the amenities it offered for the pursuit of wisdom far from the madding crowd. From early in 1307 D. Diniz himself was in residence, planning the transfer. From Rome came confirmation of the privileges already accorded to Lisbon and consent to further endowment from ecclesiastical revenues. In the autumn of 1308 teaching began, and early in the following year a royal *Charta magna privilegiorum* confirmed its status. The erstwhile royal quarter on the brief plateau crowning the city was given over to the various schools, law, medicine, logic, grammar. Theology was already taught in the monasteries of St. Domingos and St. Francisco, and continued there meanwhile. The pull of the capital persisted none the less, as strong in the teaching staff as among the students, perhaps stronger; and thirty years later, in 1338, the University was back in Lisbon at the behest of Alfonso IV. It threatened now to prove a confirmed peripatetic. In 1354 it returned to Coimbra; in 1377 Fernando I removed it once again to the capital. This time it was to remain put for 160 years. Remain for good it could not.

With the discovery of the sea route to India and the apogee of Portuguese expansion Lisbon was become, by the early sixteenth century, the *entrepôt* for the Eastern trade. One might know life there as full as the age could offer. Over two hundred vessels were to be seen

in the river at once, notes Damião de Gois in 1554, their courses set for the farthest parts of Europe, Africa, and Asia. The pretence of finding the detachment propitious to study was over-vain. Yet it was not, strangely, from an over-worldly concern that the University was suffering. Far from reflecting the palpitations of the new life surging around it, with the constant incitement of mind and imagination towards vast and unexplored horizons, it was become an anachronism, a backwater of mediaeval scholasticism outliving its due day, and students were increasingly deserting it in favour of Paris. Both considerations deeply impressed João III (1521-1557), another royal Maecenas, who was a better scholar than king and had little liking for his capital. The need for reform took shape in D. João's mind independently at first of any idea of transfer. It went back at least to 1526, when he founded at the College of St. Barbara in Paris—whose principal, Diogo de Gouveia, was a noted Portuguese humanist—some fifty or sixty scholarships for Portuguese students, chosen with a view to their appointment later in a remodelled national university.

The reorganization of the monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra in the following year was to prove of importance in the larger scheme. Santa Cruz had enjoyed considerable repute as a centre of learning in the Middle Ages, and the Hieronymite Bras de Braga, who after studies at Paris and Louvain was charged by D. João with the reform, paid particular attention to the pedagogical aspect. In 1533 the German scholar Vicente Fabricius was resident in Coimbra and teaching Greek and Latin in the new monastery schools. Two years later other scholars of repute arrived from France, and the teaching of the humanities was solidly established. Bras de Braga founded no fewer than four colleges around the monastery, two at the instance of the monarch, two to house needy students whose education formed part of the monastery's own programme of good works. By 1536 the schools of Santa Cruz ranked little short of a university in themselves, if limited to the faculties of arts and theology, and D. João later avowed that behind his reforms and

endowments there had lain the thought of an ultimate university foundation. What was not clear was whether this was to be a second university for Portugal, or merely one more phase in the long game of shuttlecock between Coimbra and Lisbon. By 1533 D. João's mind was at least made up to move the schools once more from the capital—"that the students", he writes, "might find in the calm of a provincial city more favourable conditions for their intellectual labours"—though he gave as yet no indication of whither. Anxious to bask in the refulgence of Renaissance learning, the municipal council of Coimbra straightway submitted its claim. The answer was evasive. At the Cortes in Evora in 1535 the petition was renewed, with the same result. The reason now became apparent. Evora had been for some time the favourite residence of the Court. D. João's predecessor, Manuel I, had planned in 1520 to found a university there, a plan brought to naught by his death in the following year, and Evora too was pressing its claim.

Coimbra won the day. Portugal was still to have but one university,* and this was to have but one home henceforth. A protest to the King from the professors in Lisbon went unheard, and by January of 1537 the immediate transfer of the University was ordered. A letter from D. João to Bras de Braga announces the impending arrival of the professors of theology, law, and medicine. The schools of Santa Cruz were to rank meanwhile as Faculty of Arts, with complete independence of jurisdiction. By April 9 the transfer was complete, and on May 2 a solemn oration by the Professor of Theology rang up the curtain on the most glorious chapter of the University's existence. It was worthily housed, in the royal palace of Alcáçova, of which elaborate reconstruction in the preceding reign had made the finest palace-fortress in the country. It only remained that it should be worthily staffed.

A first notable change betokened the break with tradition. The mediaeval rectorship had been an undergraduate function, generally held by two students

* Until 1559, when D. Henrique, brother of the King and Bishop of Evora, founded a university there. It was suppressed by Pombal c. 1765.

jointly, and while the direction of the *studium* meant merely the routine observance of past practice the system sufficed. The task now was to suffuse the University with the spirit of intellectual inquiry proper to a world in the throes of rebirth. Such called for age and experience, and D. João's institution of the *rector magnificus* set the seal of a new seriousness on the new Coimbra. New statutes were not to materialize till 1559, those of Lisbon, dating from 1496, applying meanwhile. The new spirit did, and Coimbra soon attracted many and eminent teachers from abroad and the pick of the nation's youth. Early among these came Camoens, Portugal's greatest poet, and to the thorough grounding it gave him in the humanities the infinite allusiveness of the *Lusíadas* bears witness, if nothing else. Written far from home and books, during years of campaigning in India, the epic testifies too to his love

For that fair city round whose verdant meads
The branching river of Mondego spreads ;

and for its University, already dear to the Muses :

From Helicon the Muses wing their way
To fair Mondego's banks in brave array.
Coimbra boasts Minerva's office hers,
Apollo with his choicest gifts concurs,
And straight beholds another Athens rise
And spread its laurels 'neath indulgent skies.

D. João continued his personal interest in every detail of university life, even to the provision of a clock. He is reputed to have known every student by name. After a decade another major project engaged him—the creation of an adequate College of Arts within the University. To the principalship of this, which opened its doors in 1547, he called André de Gouveia, a scholar of Portuguese origins and European renown. Montaigne, his pupil in the Collège de Guienne in Bordeaux, called him "*le plus grand principal de France*". Under Gouveia chairs of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, mathematics, and philosophy were instituted that were to irradiate the

humanistic influence to the farthest corners of the land. With him had come other noted scholars, prominent among them his colleague in Bordeaux, the Scotsman George Buchanan, held by many the greatest Latinist of his age. In Portugal Buchanan thought to find the peace denied him elsewhere in a Europe full of wars and the rumours of wars. But the College begun under such fair auspices was doomed to frustration. Alike in organization and in the holding of its international team together, it depended almost entirely on Gouveia. Within the year Gouveia was dead. What jealousy between Lisbon and Coimbra had been unable to effect in 1536, the larger obscurantism of peninsularity now set its hand to. Santa Cruz had felt the stigma implied in its supersession, native teachers resented their displacement by foreigners no less. The malcontents found a weapon ready to their hands in the New Inquisition, which the same João III, patron of letters, had introduced from Spain in 1536, and the death of Gouveia supplied the opportunity.

Three of the newcomers were thrown into prison on charges of heresy. Buchanan records that on him, as most foreign and least befriended, were heaped the greatest insults and injuries. He was accused of having attacked the Franciscans, eaten flesh in Lent, spoken contempt of monks, cast doubt on Purgatory. The dossier of his trial may still be read in the State archives in Lisbon; the fervour with which he rebuts the last charge in particular might be held to imply even belief in a present purgatory. For a year and a half Buchanan lay in the Inquisition cells. On this followed sentence of long reclusion in a monastery, that converse with the monks might restore him to the true faith. "They proved", he admits, "neither unkindly nor ill-disposed, but utterly ignorant of religious truth." Portugal had at least brought leisure, if not peace, the fruit of which was his celebrated Latin version of the Psalms; but when in 1552 there came, with liberation, further overtures from the King, his reply was to shake the dust of Portugal off his feet and sail for home. "Farewell," he exclaims as the coast recedes, "a long farewell, ye barren wastes and niggard soil of Portugal."

It was an unhappy experience, that must not overshadow the real distinction of Coimbra in the mid-sixteenth century, when its name was honoured far beyond the nation's confines. Yet its glory was meteoric, a matter of decades, and the germ of long and profound decay may already be read in the Scotsman's story. Portugal had welcomed the Renaissance with open arms. It now welcomed no less ardently the Counter-reform, and the two proved less compatible than in Spain. D. João's brother, the Cardinal D. Henrique, was Grand Inquisitor. Behind the chequered history of the College of Arts lay the constant ambition of the Jesuits to monopolize education, and in 1555 D. João made over its administration to them. The day was theirs. For two centuries the Society was to hold sway over the fortunes not only of the College but of the University; and when, having plumbed the depths, reform is again attempted in the eighteenth century, they will be arraigned unequivocally as the villains of the piece. There were, needless to say, contributory causes. As the University had soared on a wave of imperial greatness, so it sank into the trough of political decay. In 1580 Portugal, that had long schemed to absorb Spain, fell into the lap of Philip II. For sixty years the Peninsula was one, and nowhere was the decadence of seventeenth-century thought and letters more marked than in Portugal.

The recovery of political independence in 1640 did not spell intellectual independence, but rather a substitution of allegiance. For a century and more France took the place of Spain. As much was to happen in Spain itself, particularly with the advent of a Bourbon dynasty in 1700. But, as in Spain, the stimulus was extra-academic. The eighteenth century was not a period of especial lustre even for French universities, many of which could then boast but two faculties, and a number only one. In the Peninsula there was not much to choose between Coimbra and Salamanca. Both lay off the main line in both senses, and the age of enlightenment might have passed the one by as disdainfully as it did the other had it not been for a statesman's strong dislike of the Society of Jesus. The breach

between science and teaching was complete, the one constantly advancing on an empirical basis, the other entrenching itself more and more obstinately behind a wall of dogmatism.

Coimbra had known occasional visitations. It received new statutes, after those of 1559, in 1565, in 1592, in 1612, in 1653. But just as its period of greatness had found it without any formal constitution, so these reforms, far from being directed towards the greater liberty and efficiency of teaching, were often mere moves in the struggle for sectarian domination. Such, for example, were the Jesuit reforms of 1592 and 1612, the former of which abolished the compulsory study of logic for law students introduced in 1431 and generally reorganized legal studies on a basis long out of date. The result was a constant descent in the scale alike of seriousness and of prestige. In the Faculty of Theology itself, as late as the second half of the eighteenth century, students had to be bribed to attend by devices such as the granting of credit for courses never followed. At the period of matriculation students would turn up in their hundreds to enrol, and disappear forthwith, being no more seen till the time of examination. Yet rejection was all but unheard of. The majority of chairs in the Faculty of Law had no occupant. No pretence at serious teaching existed in Medicine. The chair of Mathematics lay vacant for sixty years, and had meant nothing for very much longer. As for the once noble College of Arts, not only were students known to sit examinations by deputy, but it was notorious that passes were to be had for payment, and no questions asked. If of incentive to study there was thus none, such students as did reside were inevitably corrupted into licence. Relations with the townspeople had led to tension already in the middle of the sixteenth century, but resentment then had sprung from the royal favours and privileges showered on the University and was directed against teachers and taught alike. In the two following centuries student irresponsibility exhausted the calendar of crimes, even to organized banditry. In January 1721 a force of 400 soldiers had to be sent to quell a particularly noxious band.

Short of an earthquake it seemed there was no cure for such decline. In 1755, in Lisbon, the earthquake came. Fifty thousand people perished, £20,000,000 of property was destroyed, the Government in panic considered flight to Rio de Janeiro. It was then there emerged, as the man of the hour, the Marquis of Pombal, invested with absolute powers by the King, José I, and possessed of an instant resolve to rebuild, from the bottom up, not merely the capital but society itself. All vested interests were straightway joined against him. The Inquisition and the Jesuits would have been prominent among them even were they not clearly marked out as the first victims. The charge laid against the Jesuits of complicity in an attack on the King's life in 1758 gave Pombal his opportunity. In 1759 the Society's property was sequestered and its members expelled the country, a lead that France was to follow in 1762 and Spain in 1767. Secularization of education necessarily ensued. But something more than secularization was needed to make of Coimbra a university worthy of the name. The reform of the University of Coimbra in 1772 takes precedence among all the reforms—and they were many and notable—undertaken by Pombal. Investigations were launched in 1665. A commission sat from 1770, Pombal rarely missing a session: its deliberations were characterized no less by meticulous attention to detail than by their rigorously scientific conception of the academic function. In September 1771 the University was notified that its administration and teaching activities were suspended. The new statutes were promulgated in the following August. They were incomplete as yet. The scientific bias of the age had deposed the humanities from their pinnacle, and the College of Arts was left unheeded. This notwithstanding, the reform admits comparison with nothing so exactly as with the rebuilding of Lisbon after the earthquake.

The Statutes deal successively and exhaustively with the Faculties of Theology, Laws, Medicine, Mathematics and Philosophy, enunciating the principles that must preside over the teaching in each and detailing the organization of studies down to class hours and texts.

The last two faculties were new creations ; that of Medicine was reorganized *ab ovo*. In all five the authors are at pains to stress the historical aspect of their disciplines, and to make of history itself not the arid exposition of fact it had been till then but essentially a study in interpretation and an exercise in right thinking. Students of theology are thus enjoined to get down to original texts and sources, that mere tradition be not held to constitute authority nor any dogma be received as immune from scrutiny. The novelty in the prescriptions for legal studies lies in the emphatic subordination of Roman to Portuguese law. That those called to administer the nation's laws for two centuries past should have received a merely theoretic instruction in Roman law only was typical of the old order of things. With Pombal the scientific study of Portuguese law is born.

Medicine, mathematics, and philosophy, natural and moral, are considered as members of a whole : they are the "sciences of reason . . . comprising all such as are not founded on the authority of the laws of God and man". The section begins with a vigorous attack on the scholastic philosophy till then in possession of the field, which the King "is pleased to abolish and banish not merely from the University but from every school, public and private, secular and regular, throughout all his kingdoms and dominions". In view of the constant advances in scientific knowledge and the urgent need of incorporating these in teaching, it is then decreed that the three faculties shall organize a joint academy, as it were, of sciences— forerunner of the Academy of Sciences founded in Lisbon two years later—to work for the advancement of science, both for the sake of science and for the greater stimulus to students. It is the formal consecration of research as part of a university's function, and bears honourable comparison not only with Salamanca, where in 1761 a proposal for an Academy of Mathematics was rejected as "spelling dishonour to the University", but even with Oxford, where we must wait till 1882 for an enactment that "it shall be the duty of every Professor to assist the pursuit of knowledge and to contribute to the advancement of it".

The international aspect of science becomes more

important the smaller the country. Hence the student of medicine is laid under weighty injunction to acquaint himself with Latin, Greek, English, and French. He will further take a course in Moral Philosophy, with special reference to the ethics of his future profession. Medical studies proper will constantly combine the practical with the theoretical, the classroom giving way more and more to the hospital, where the entire fifth year shall be spent. Mathematics had been a dead letter at Coimbra for two centuries. As the best exemplar of the exact sciences, and the basis of them all, the fact is eloquent of the resulting chaos, "as of the universe were it deprived of the sun". The provision is thus significant that the mathematical classrooms shall always be open to casual as well as regular students, those who may come "moved merely by curiosity, for the adornment of their minds". One year of mathematics was to be obligatory for all students of theology and law. The new Faculty of Philosophy provided a four-year course covering logic, metaphysics, ethics, natural history, experimental physics, and chemistry. The first three disciplines were combined in a single chair, the others were allotted one each. In the provision laid down for the practical teaching of these may be still seen today the most tangible results of the reform, in a magnificent botanical garden, museums of natural history and experimental physics and a chemistry laboratory.

Such in briefest outline were the famous Statutes of 1772. Differing from all previous reforms in that they went beyond administrative change to pedagogical principles and programmes, it is in virtue of this that they wrought a second renaissance in higher Portuguese education, whose momentum is not yet spent. With their enactment study became once more a serious vocation. Of some 4000 Bohemian students previous to 1772, three-fourths returned to where they belonged. Pombal himself aimed at not more than 1200. The nucleus of the new staff came from those who had elaborated the Statutes. For theology and law the native supply sufficed, but again many foreigners had to be called in. Among them was an Englishman, Simon

Gould, appointed Professor of Medicine. From Italy came mathematicians, chemists and botanists, from Austria another professor of medicine. The reform had its defects. The absence of any provision for the humanities is striking, even given the trend of the age. The recommendation of languages to medical students was but a pious hope while no provision was made for them even as auxiliary studies. That the reaction from the purely speculative disciplines was excessive is well seen in the one joint chair for logic, metaphysics, and ethics. A more serious matter, inherent in most eighteenth-century reforms in the Peninsula, was that they were imposed autocratically on a people whose will to enlightenment was too easily taken for granted. José I died in 1777. Pombal's fall was immediate and absolute. Serious charges were at once instituted against him, and he was fortunate to escape into, and in 1782 to die in, obscurity. Coimbra was equally fortunate not to see all his reforms revoked out of hand. That the calamity was averted was thanks almost entirely to the energy and persistence of one man, the Rector, Francisco de Lemos. As it was the chair of philosophy was suppressed in 1791.

The nineteenth century was again one of decline. The Napoleonic Wars preluded for Portugal an era of political turmoil such that the cultural life of the nation came to a standstill. Coimbra relapsed into a backwater, that still attracted the élite of the country's youth, there being no other university; but the stimulus they derived was born largely of reaction from the teaching of the classroom. Since the eighteen-twenties Coimbra has bred chiefly rebels. It was here that Almeida Garrett imbibed the Liberalism that drove him into exile in 1823, whence he returned to propagate a romanticism that has never since wholly disappeared from Portuguese letters. And its adherents are few who did not first try their hand at poetry by the banks of the Mondego. Here too in 1865 Antero de Quental raised the standard of the Anti-romantics in a resounding polemic. If the intellectual life of the nation has not always been nurtured as it should at Coimbra, its literary life is inextricably bound up with it.

The University of Coimbra roams no more. Its danger now is that it may be left in peace and forgotten about. In 1911 the year-old Republic, interpreting the needs of the twentieth century, introduced a last and drastic reform with the creation of two new universities in Lisbon and Oporto. Students at Lisbon already outnumber the thousand odd of Coimbra, and no ruler may now forbid them the distractions of the capital, whither the applied sciences inevitably gravitate. But the humanities will always flourish more serenely in the clearer and calmer atmosphere of Coimbra, and time in its whirligigs has thus atoned for the oversight of Pombal. Even apart from the suppression by the dictatorship, on political grounds, of the Faculty of Arts at Oporto, Coimbra seems destined to become more and more an Arts university. As such it still has a vital part to play in the training of young Portugal. All the intangibles at least are in its favour.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

THE CATHOLIC UKRAINIAN-CANADIANS

- The Ukrainian-Canadians.* A Study in Assimilation. By Charles H. Young, M.A. (Toronto, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1931.)
- Catholic Problems in Western Canada.* By George Thomas Daly, C.S.S.R. (Toronto, The MacMillan Company of Canada, Ltd., 1921.)
- Ukraine and its People.* By Stephen Rudnitsky, Ph.D. (New York, Rand McNally & Co., 1918.)
- Un A Pôtre de L'Union des Eglises au XVII^e e Siècle.* Par Le Révérendissimi Dom Alphonse Guépin. (Paris, H. Oudin, 1897. 2 vols.)
- The Ukraine.* By Prince D. S. Mirsky. (*Quarterly Review*, April, 1923, p. 318.)

SOME forty years ago the Catholic Church in Canada found itself faced, suddenly and unexpectedly, with a major problem, for the solution of which it was totally unprepared. The most pressing need of Canada was, at that time, settlers for the farm lands of the West, and when in 1896 the Liberal Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Clifford Sifton, a Western man, who became Minister of the Interior in the new Cabinet, lost no time in looking about for a suitable source of supply. He found it among the land-hungry Ukrainians of Galicia and Bukowina, then both provinces of Austria, who, as the result of an intensive advertising campaign, began pouring into the country in scores of thousands. The movement continued until interrupted by the War and was resumed, but in greatly diminished proportions, after peace had been proclaimed. The Ukrainians were eager to own land, and settled for the most part on farms in the three prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, though many eventually found their way to the cities, and they are now to be found, in considerable numbers, in almost every province of the Dominion.

The great majority of these newcomers were Catholics, but of the Ruthenian Rite, a variant of the Byzantine, and their religious customs and modes of worship

appeared so strange that Canadian Catholics, knowing nothing of any rite other than the Latin, could scarcely believe that they were Catholics at all. To make matters worse, the immigrants, who were of the peasant class, came without priests or other leaders and were thus all the more dependent upon the help of their Canadian fellow Catholics—a help, however, which for reasons to be presently stated they did not desire, and which the local Catholics were quite unable, and indeed to some extent unwilling, to furnish in a degree at all adequate to the need. Such a sudden and unexpected incursion of vast numbers of Catholics of an Eastern rite into a country where the Latin had theretofore alone existed was an experience almost unique in the history of the Church. In order to understand the situation thus created it will, however, be necessary to say something of the past history of the newcomers.

Who are the Ukrainians? They are a submerged nationality, numbering some thirty-three millions. The Ukraine, their country, extends roughly from the Carpathian Mountains to the Caspian Sea and from the Black Sea and the Caucasus Mountains to the Pripiet Marshes. Within these limits dwells a population of some forty-six millions, of whom about seventy per cent are Ukrainians. The people of the Russian Ukraine, of the province of Bukowina and of the Ukrainian portions of Besarabia, both of the latter now included in Rumania, are almost all adherents of the Orthodox Eastern Church. All those of Eastern Galicia (now in Poland) and the majority of those of Ruthenia (now a province of Czecho-Slovakia) are Catholics, but belong to the Ruthenian Rite. Like most Byzantine Catholics, they call themselves "Greek Catholics", meaning thereby that they are Catholics in religion and "Greek" (i.e. Byzantine) in rite. While in religion they are Ruthenians, they insist (save in Ruthenia) that their nationality is Ukrainian, although until the middle of the nineteenth century, when a national revival took place, those outside Russia were known for all purposes as Ruthenians. Indeed, even those of the Russian Ukraine were originally known as Ruthenians. The Russians do not admit that

the Ukrainians are a separate race and call them Little Russians—a name they deeply resent.

The Ruthenians, with their capital first at Novgorod and then at Kief, were in fact the first Russians. The Great Russians of the North emerged in history at a much later period. The Ruthenians were converted to Christianity under their King, St. Vladimir (984-1015), by Byzantine missionaries, at a time when Constantinople was still Catholic, but they later shared in the Great Schism. In the twelfth century Halec (Galicia) became an independent State, but was in 1340 absorbed by Poland. The country of which Kief was the capital was in 1320 conquered by Lithuania, and in 1386 passed under the dominion of Poland. The Ukraine proper, in 1654, shook off the Polish yoke and asserted its independence, but was soon absorbed by Russia. Galicia, Volyhnia, and Podolia remained under the rule of Poland until the partitions, when the first named passed to Austria and the other two to Russia. Western Galicia is predominantly Polish, and the Austrian Government, in later years, on the principle of "divide to rule", gave the Poles the upper hand in the governing of the Province. In the result, therefore, the Ukrainians, particularly those of Galicia, look on the Poles as their hereditary enemies, under whose heel they have been for more than six centuries.

The fact that the Poles are their fellow Catholics has not helped the situation. This also has a historical explanation. In 1595, as a result of the Counter-Reformation (1550-1600), the Ruthenian bishops of their own accord made their submission to Rome. In this they were at first unanimous, but two later withdrew and the union encountered the bitter opposition not only of these two but of a very large section of the laity as well, headed by Prince Ostrogski, at that time, next to the King, the most powerful man in Poland. There followed half a century of bitter strife, but after the elimination of the Ukraine proper, the chief seat of the opposition, the union was completely victorious. This result was obtained despite the opposition of the Polish Government and Diet, the members of which

regarded the controversy as an unnecessary aggravation of the difficulty of governing the kingdom. This opposition might, indeed, have proved fatal had it not been for the personal efforts of King Sigismund III (1587-1632) and King Ladislas VII (1632-1648), both enthusiastic supporters of the union.

The success of the movement was also despite the indifference and worse of the Latin Catholics, clerical as well as lay, who often treated their Ruthenian fellow Catholics with contempt, deeming them to be at most only half Catholics. As an example of this it may be mentioned that Rutski, Metropolitan of the Ruthenian Church (1614-1637), complained bitterly that, though a noble and a metropolitan presiding over seven suffragan bishops, he was expected by the Latin ecclesiastics to take rank after mere cathedral canons. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the Ruthenian nobles, having become Catholics, all passed eventually to the Latin Rite, and hence the Poles have been accustomed ever since to refer contemptuously to the Ruthenian Rite as a "religion of peasants".

This was the historical background that the Ukrainian immigrants brought with them to their new Canadian home. The Poles were their hereditary enemies, and since the only Latins they had previously known were Poles, Latin and Polish were to them synonymous terms. Hence their mistrust of Canadian Catholics. Nevertheless, they were, as they still are, a very devout people, as witness the fact that, though they had no priests, their first act in any settlement, after providing shelter for their families, was usually to erect a church, in which to meet and pray in common. About 1900 they applied for priests to Mgr. Szeptycki, Archbishop of Lwow, who unfortunately was not in a position to supply them. He was, however, able to send one priest, Rev. Father Zoldak, who was followed later by another secular priest, four monks of St. Basil the Great, and four sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Conception, both Ruthenian orders.

For the next decade these six priests were the only clergy of their own rite available for a Catholic population numbering, at that time, probably from 150,000 to

200,000, settled on isolated farms scattered over an area thousands of miles in extent. It was some time before the Canadian ecclesiastical authorities realized the nature of the situation that had arisen. Soon, however, an urgent call for help came from Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface, Manitoba. Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Belgian Redemptorists, and a few French-Canadian secular priests gladly responded to the call. The difficulties in their way were, however, enormous—difference of rite, unfamiliarity with the Ukrainian tongue and with Old Slavonic, the language of the liturgy and, worst of all, the prejudice against them of those whom they sought to serve. The French-Canadian secular priests were permitted to enter the Ruthenian Rite, temporarily, for a period of ten years. Rev. Father Delaere, a Belgian Redemptorist, arrived about 1900 and in 1906 entered the Ruthenian Rite, as others of his order did later. Even with the addition of these Latins, the number of priests was totally inadequate for the care of so large and scattered a population. Moreover, the Latin priests, even those who had entered the Ruthenian Rite, were so unacceptable that their co-operation tended only to prejudice the people against their own Ruthenian priests.

The destitute religious condition of the Catholic Ukrainians, coupled with the fact that they had come from a country exclusively Catholic, where they had had no experience of anti-Catholic propaganda, proved rich soil for the proselytizers. The first of these to arrive were the Russian Orthodox. There were in every Ukrainian settlement a nucleus of Orthodox from Bukowina who were left, like their Catholic brethren, without religious leadership. They applied for priests to the Metropolitan of Bukowina, but were informed that by an arrangement with the Holy Synod of Russia they were to be cared for by priests assigned to them by the Russian Orthodox hierarchy already established in America. As early as 1900 these Russian priests came, well supplied with funds. They did not, however, by any means confine their efforts to those of their own communion. On the contrary, they sought and obtained

very considerable support from among the less instructed of Ukrainian Catholics, who found that they had so much more in common with these Russian priests than they had with the Latin priests who were endeavouring to serve them.

The Russian Orthodox Church thus established prospered to such an extent that by 1916 it had in the three prairie provinces sixty-five churches and twenty-six priests. Its triumphal progress was, however, soon to terminate. The Russian Revolution of 1917 deprived it of its source of revenue, and the independence of the Ukraine, short-lived though it was, so stimulated Ukrainian national sentiment as to lead to the founding in Canada of a branch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which robbed the Russian Orthodox Church of a large proportion of its adherents. Its influence has, moreover, for some time been steadily declining, because of the growing indifference of the rising generation. It ceased long ago to be a menace to the Catholic Church.

Close upon the heels of the Russians came the Protestants and, to their shame be it said, there was scarcely one of the sects that did not resort to the use of Catholic vestments, candles, incense, holy water, etc., in an effort to deceive those whom they sought to pervert. The most active were the Presbyterians, who with the assistance of renegade Ukrainians established what was known as the Greek Independent Church. Ostensibly an independent body manned by Ukrainians and making use of the Ruthenian liturgy in Old Slavonic, it was from the beginning purely a creature of the Presbyterian Church, sponsored and financed by its Board of Home Missions. The Board, taking advantage of the intense desire of the Ukrainians for education, induced a certain number of youths to accept free education at the Presbyterian College at Winnipeg and, having destroyed their faith, secured their ordination by the Orthodox bishop as priests for the new Church. These priests were, however, entered as "colporteurs" on the Presbyterian pay-roll. The whole proceeding was highly discreditable to those concerned, yet it met with phenomenal success. Beginning in 1903, it had by 1905

twenty priests and between 20,000 and 30,000 adherents, drawn chiefly from the Catholics, and in 1907 the Board of Home Missions reported that it had "prevented 30,000 to 40,000 people from falling under the sway of the Church of Rome".

The collapse of the movement was, however, as sudden as its rise. In 1913 Presbyterian criticism of the expenditure involved forced the Board of Home Missions to give the priests the choice of openly joining the Presbyterian Church or foraging for themselves. This let the cat out of the bag, and when the people at length realized that the Independent Greek Church was nothing but the Presbyterian Church in disguise, they declined to follow their priests into that denomination. Various Protestant bodies, particularly the Presbyterians and the United Church (the latter formed by a union of the Methodists, the Congregationalists, and a section of the Presbyterians), have continued to spend large sums on the "evangelization" of the Ukrainians. Protestant centres of influence—hospitals, public halls, etc.—are maintained in all important Ukrainian communities, boys are educated free in Protestant colleges and universities, and Protestant periodicals and anti-Catholic literature, printed in the Ukrainian language, are widely circulated. In so far as making Protestants of the Ukrainians is concerned, these efforts have met with little success. This is admitted by the Protestants themselves, as witness the following references to the matter, taken from recent reports. The United Church Report for 1930, page 162, says :

Over forty missionaries were employed at one time. At present the staff consists of ten ministers and three students. Though the actual membership of the Ukrainian people in the United Church is disappointing, yet a great liberalizing movement can be traced to these early efforts.

The Presbyterian report for the same year, page 42, says :

We failed in our Ukrainian work, spent a huge amount of good people's money—that is true. But not all is failure. There is a track of our ploughing.

There is not in fact, in all Canada, a congregation of Protestant Ukrainians large enough to support a pastor. The effect has, however, been to promote religious indifference among the Ukrainians and to weaken the loyalty of many of them to the Catholic Church. That, no doubt, is what is meant by "a great liberalizing movement" and "a track of our ploughing" in the above extracts. One lamentable result is that many of the better educated among the Ukrainians, those who should be leaders of the people, have ceased to practise their religion. For example, of the half-dozen who are or have been members of the legislatures, Dominion or provincial, only one is a practising Catholic. The situation in this respect is, however, improving. Many Ukrainian young men are now attending Catholic colleges and universities, and a college maintained by the Christian Brothers exclusively for Ukrainians is well attended. Through the influence of this latter institution Ukrainian young men are becoming Christian Brothers, so that the college may eventually be staffed exclusively by Ukrainians.

A religious education is also being provided for Ukrainian girls, not only by the Servants of the Immaculate Conception, with more than 100 professed nuns, but by several communities of Latin nuns as well. Moreover, Latin sisters now staff several Catholic hospitals, located in Ukrainian centres. The chief difficulty in the way of all these works is lack of funds. The great majority of the Ukrainians are poor and it is difficult to impress Latin Catholics with the necessity of affording adequate support.

In 1910 the Canadian bishops, realizing that the Ukrainian problem was beyond them, sought the advice of Mgr. Szeptycki, who in an elaborate and able report emphasized that a Ruthenian bishopric in Canada was an absolute necessity. This view was adopted at Rome, a bishop was appointed and civil incorporation obtained for the "Ruthenian Greek Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Canada". The most crying need being for more Ruthenian priests, the new bishop made prompt efforts to secure them from Galicia; but in this he was greatly

hampered by a regulation, issued at the instance of the Canadian hierarchy, forbidding the bringing of married priests to Canada and the ordaining there of married men. As eighty per cent of the secular clergy of Galicia were married, the bishop was limited in his choice to such celibates and widowers as could be induced to come. Moreover, the regulation was very unpopular amongst the Ukrainians, who were generally in favour of a married secular clergy, and this tended to increase their prejudice against the Latins.

Not long after his appointment the new bishop was obliged to face what proved to be the most serious menace to the faith of the Catholic Ukrainians yet encountered, namely, the establishment of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The movement began in 1916, with a dispute between the bishop and certain of his people over the control of a students' hostel at Saskatoon, and culminated in 1921 with the organization of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, as a branch of the body of the same name then recently organized in Russia. No regularly ordained priest, Catholic or dissident, joined the new Church, which was as bitterly opposed by the Russian Orthodox as it was by the Catholics. Its "priests" received their "ordination" from a "bishop" of the parent body in Russia who had been "consecrated" by the hand of a dead bishop, disinterred for the purpose. Nevertheless, the new Church secured many adherents, at the expense of the Catholics as well as of the Russian Orthodox. At the zenith of its success it claimed to have 25,000 members, 38,000 under pastoral care, and twenty-one "priests". Then, for some time, it was only holding its own and, later, it began to dwindle. Ukrainian nationalism, on which the Church is based, must necessarily appeal in an ever lessening degree to the rising generation whose interest is centred in Canada. Very recently (1935) the Church has split into two warring factions, one looking towards Constantinople and the other still faithful to Kief.

The efforts of the Protestants to destroy the faith of the Catholic Ukrainians, while they had not the effect of making Protestants of them, had doubtless much to

do with preparing the ground for the spread of Communism. Communism among the Ukrainians is not, however, so great a menace as it is thought to be by many Canadians of other racial origins. The Ukrainians are, it is true, the largest social group in the Communist party, but Ukrainian-Communists are a relatively insignificant minority of Ukrainian-Canadians.

The situation with regard to the Catholic Ukrainians has for some years been steadily improving. Many lapsed Catholics have returned to the faith, and Mgr. Ladyka, the present bishop, calculates that his subjects number 300,000. The relations between the two rites, while they still leave much to be desired, are improving, although lack of interest on the part of the Latins, and the fear of Latinization on the part of the Ukrainians, still render co-operation difficult.

Bishop Ladyka's greatest difficulty is still the dearth of priests. There are at present only thirty-two seculars and thirty-two regulars, to serve 350 parishes and missions, scattered over Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The regulars are made up of monks of St. Basil the Great and Redemptorists of the Ruthenian Rite. The latter were formerly Belgians, but are now almost all Ukrainians. Vocations to the priesthood are, however, increasing. A Ruthenian seminary has been decided upon, and in the meantime twenty-two Ukrainian young men are being educated for the priesthood of the Ruthenian Rite in various Latin seminaries. In view of this and of what has been said of education and of the elimination of the danger of proselytism, we may look with some confidence to the future of the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church of Canada, the Church of the Catholic Ukrainian-Canadians.

W. L. SCOTT.

THE SPOILT CONVERT

DURING Richard Waldo Sibthorp's first and transient period in the Church which he had already tried to enter in his boyhood, certain Catholics in Birmingham, a little nettled perhaps by the eager welcome given him by Cardinal Wiseman, nicknamed him the Spoilt Convert. If they could have foreseen the future they might have chosen instead to call him the Recurring Decimal. For not only did his strange irresolution cause him "thrice to bridge the chasm", as Mr. Gladstone romantically put it, "between Canterbury and Rome", but from the first of these exits and entrances down to the present day Anglican writers have used his name (like that of his great contemporary John Henry Newman) in spasmodic efforts to prove that if the Church of England in the "forties" had been Anglo-Catholic neither would have left her. They overlook two facts: that these men lived till 1879 and 1890 respectively, so could have had in their lifetime all that Anglo-Catholicism offers now (except a "Liberal-Catholic" element which would have deeply shocked them); and that Mr. Sibthorp's letters show a dislike and scorn of "Ritualism", due, perhaps, to his Evangelical convictions when an Anglican, or possibly to the Catholicism he learnt—and but for main force would have embraced—when he was an undergraduate of nineteen at Magdalen.

The latest recurrence of the Sibthorp legend is to be found in *Magdalen Studies*, by Mr. Middleton. This book unfortunately contains very little about "one of the most enchanting Colleges of Oxford", a description of Magdalen few will dispute; and the studies are confined to so small a circle that a reader who knew nothing of Oxford might imagine Magdalen, with her long tradition, to have been nothing but a sort of nursery for Tractarians, which was closed down as soon as the first generation of the movement had left its sheltering walls. To include Richard Sibthorp amongst the Tractarians he disliked, and to depict him as an Anglo-Catholic *manqué*, can only have been possible by dis-

regarding all the abundant evidence to the contrary given by the Rev. J. Fowler, his friend and curate during his second Anglican period, in the *Life* from which Mr. Middleton, who has evidently learned Stevenson's "art of omitting", has taken most of his material for the Sibthorp study.

Though by so doing he has assured a welcome for his book in Anglo-Catholic circles, he has missed a great opportunity. The real interest of Richard Sibthorp's life lies in the spiritual struggle which indeed began at Magdalen, where he made his first abortive attempt to become a Catholic in 1811, but lasted till 1879, when, fourteen years after his return to the Church, he died a Catholic priest, taking his baffling secret literally to the grave with him. For—it is said at his own request—he was buried in Lincoln cemetery and a clergyman of the Church of England read the Prayer-book service for the Burial of the Dead at the graveside the day after his Requiem was sung in St. Chad's Cathedral in Birmingham.

Why does his pale ghost flit across the records of so many other far more purposeful lives? Why did Cardinal Wiseman think so highly of him as to ordain him to the priesthood only five months* after his reception into the Church, and grieve so deeply at his speedy defection as to spend a day in bed to recover from the shock of that bad news? Why did the dying Cardinal set such store by the lapsed priest's return that a note in the latter's missal states: "I resumed the great privilege of saying Mass on the 25th January, 1865, in the private chapel of Cardinal Wiseman, and at his special desire, in York Place, Baker Street, Portman Square, London"? Why did his conversion in 1841 result in a spate of literature from those who deplored his loss, and give rise to so

* After his return to the Church in 1865, Mr. Sibthorp noted on the fly-leaf of his missal:

"I was received into the Catholic Church at the chapel of Oscott College on the Eve of St. Simon and St. Jude, Oct. 27, 1841, by Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman.

"I was ordained acolyth (sic), with the three preceding minor orders, on Ember Saturday, in Advent, December, 1841. Sub-deacon on Ember Saturday, in Lent, February 19, 1842. Deacon on Passion Sunday, March 13, 1842. Priest on Ember Saturday after Whit-Sunday, May 21, 1842."

much questioning that in 1842 he published *Some Answers to the Inquiry "Why are You Become a Catholic?"* and *A Further Answer to the Inquiry*,* etc., the latter of which can hardly have left the printers' hands when the question to which his friends now sought an answer had changed into "Why have you ceased to be one?"

The answer is to be found, I think, in the account of those years between 1815 and 1841, described so candidly by Mr. Fowler. There can be no question in the minds of those who read the account of the enthusiasm his preaching evoked and then compare it with the extracts from his sermons and letters so copiously provided, that he possessed that strange magnetism which can hold huge multitudes spellbound quite irrespective of what the speaker is saying—sometimes, even, as foreigners have found when listening to Hitler, when much that he says is quite incomprehensible. There is nothing in Mr. Sibthorp's published sermons or in his letters on religious matters to account for the stir his sermons made; and his career is no exception to that of so many others who have in their day had many listeners, but, to judge by the results, few followers.

His biographer's short account of Richard Sibthorp's early years helps to explain his unusual story. Delicate, sensitive (rough games and out-of-door amusements were little to his taste), he spent much of his time as a child in the workshop of the village joiner and in planting evergreens (of all dull objects) in what was known as "Mr. Richard's garden" in the grounds of Canwick Hall. His "constitutional timidity and apprehensiveness, which clung to him from his cradle to his grave", and the "decided spirit of independence and dislike of dictation" which also characterized him help to account for his remarkable history.

The elements which composed the religious atmosphere of his childhood are candidly described as the "swaddling-clothes of old-fashioned Church of England principles", which one of his temperament and tendencies

* It is interesting to note that this was written as an answer to the Rev. W. Dodsworth, who was, to quote Mr. Fowler, "destined some years later to own the spell of the enchantress".

would soon outgrow ; though the attraction Methodist zeal and enthusiasm had for him later was considered an unusual one for "a county gentleman, however zealously disposed". But another influence besides that of his parents and of his Methodist friends in the village helped to mould him. Colonel Sibthorp, while travelling in Germany, made friends with "a most learned and accomplished French priest, the Reverend Abbé Beaumont", who before the Revolution had been Rector and Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Caen. With extraordinary broadmindedness the exiled priest was made welcome in the house of a man who fully shared the anti-Catholic prejudices of his contemporaries, and remained there till his host's influence secured his appointment to the Catholic chapel opened in Lincoln in 1799. Richard Sibthorp was only seven years old when the Abbé ceased to be one of the household ; but later on Father Beaumont taught him French during his vacations. Though

Richard always averred that the good Frenchman never abused his father's generous hospitality so far as to indoctrinate his young friend and pupil with his peculiar tenets, the boy would almost inevitably contrast the Catholic priest with the English parson ; and . . . it was by no means certain that the Established clergyman would bear the palm as regarded simplicity of life and devotion to duty.

When, "to the distress of his parents, the boy had been found kneeling at his prayers before a crucifix", they believed the Abbé's influence was to blame, and William Wilberforce (whose sons Robert and Henry later took the step he feared for his friend's boy) said to his father (with some other words of warning), "*That boy will become a Roman Catholic.*"

As the French lessons took place during school vacations, his intercourse with Father Beaumont probably continued till, after a few years at Westminster School (to which he went from a private school at Eltham, kept by the curate of that parish, where he was very happy), he got a demyship at Magdalen in 1810. Here he used to attend the Roman Catholic Chapel at St. Clement's

surreptitiously, "had a crucifix hanging up in his room in College", and in the October term of 1811 suddenly disappeared from Oxford, telling no one but his friend and "companion demy", Zachary Biddulph, where he had gone, in order to be received into the Church.

The accounts of that flight given by Richard Sibthorp in later years differ according to his religious allegiance at the time of writing them.

Years later (the date is not given, but it is probably while he was struggling against the desire to become a Catholic which preceded his first "crossing of the chasm" in 1841) he wrote :

If ever Popery gains the upper hand, I do not expect her friends will forget how nearly they had me within their clutches. An interval of two or three hours had (humanly speaking) seen the deed done, and myself a member of the Church of Rome. But in that interval God stretched forth His arm and plucked me out of the net.

What exactly happened is not clear, as the only contemporary evidence is contained in the letters exchanged by Colonel Sibthorp (for some strange reason he is always called Colonel Humphry, his Christian name, and his wife Mrs. Humphry, in the biography) and Dr. Routh, the famous President of Magdalen. But it is certain that the youngest son's disappearance caused great anxiety, and in a long letter to Dr. Bloxam, written over sixty years later, he gives some interesting particulars of the way he was "plucked out of the net".

He writes :

Biddulph was my confidant in my first flight to Birmingham. I do not blame him. My family pressed him so hard, about the possible return of paralysis to my father, if I kept hid longer, that he could hardly but give way. You can hardly conceive the feelings about Popery at that time. My dear mother—no unkind or austere woman—would, I believe, consider Popish priests much the same as pagans. And they, poor men (except brought up at Douay), snubbed and avoided, were, as a general rule, rather unpresentable in better circles of society.

He mentions the result of his parents being informed in the course of a brief allusion to Bishop Milner :

I remember our Bishop Milner quite well—a ponderous and impressive-looking and -mannered man, marvellously attractive in varied conversation, specially on ecclesiastical matters; very informal himself in Church duties. His crozier was a walking-stick, with the crook in his pocket, which he stuck on when needed. I passed two nights in his house at Wolverhampton, on my first flight from Oxford to join the Catholic Church; from which I was brought back (*vi et armis*, I may say), under police surveillance and Chancery order, by my eldest brother, Coningsby! So I have passed through some rather strange adventures.

Meanwhile an almost incredible incident took place at Canwick Hall.

Mr. Sibthorp, who always had a keen enjoyment of the ludicrous, used to tell it in after days with infinite humour. During the consternation caused in the household by his flight, a search was made among his miscellaneous properties, probably with the view of procuring evidence of his place of concealment, and among his most valued treasures there was found a very beautiful model in ivory, fifteen inches high, of the *Venus de Medici*, and the finder, not well-versed in the artistic attributes of the *Madonna*, exclaimed, as though he had found a second "Popish Plot", "Here she is; *the Virgin Mary!*" and flung her into the fire!

His father wrote the following letter to Dr. Routh, dated 7 November, 1811, saying:

The dread of public examination in the schools was not the inducement of my son's flight from college. It is founded on a deeper and far more afflictive cause, which makes his return impossible, and has been kept from my knowledge or suspicion from the kindest motives, until the cause and effect could no longer be concealed. He falls the second victim * within your and my knowledge to Catholic cunning, and adds another triumph to the unwearied ambition of proselytism. I received last night a long justification of the steps which he has taken, and means to take, much too artificial to be his own. I do not impute the letter to Rock,† with whom my son has had frequent conferences—who appears, from one of his letters which I have in my possession, to be an ignorant bigot—but I rather ascribe it to the well-known Milner, who has been in the habit of corresponding with him, and

* Henry Best, who is the subject of one of the *Magdalen Studies*.

† A priest at Kiddington, near Woodstock, a friend of Fr. Martyn.

fixing the fluctuations of his mind. But I suspect (what I cannot prove) that the priest* who resides in Lincoln has had a deep and busy hand in the plot.

Three days later (surely a notable "post-haste" in 1811) Dr. Routh replied :

I sincerely condole with you on your son's unhappy defection to the schismatical and corrupt communion of the English Romanists. Their former convert, to whom you allude, the late Fellow of this College, was, though a good scholar, remarkable for his eccentricity and want of judgment ; and the early years of your injured and deceived child must contribute to diminish their triumph. At the same time, how do I moan and detest this calamitous inroad on the peace and happiness of a religious and respected family ! If I could by any method effect the return of your son to the true Catholic Church, established by God's providence in this country, nothing would give me greater pleasure. I add that the college is still open to his return, and that no one will receive greater joy from it than myself, with the exception of his distressed father and nearest relatives.

But young Sibthorp clung gallantly to the meshes of the net, and two months passed before his father could speak of him as "half-recovered", in a second letter to Dr. Routh, dated 15 January, 1812 :

My dear Richard, more than half recovered from the errors into which he half betrayed himself, has promised to alleviate the weight of my affliction. The conversations of our worthy friend, Mr. F. Swan, and the books which he has read at home, have had the best effect ; and little more remains to be done than to overcome the conscious sense of shame and the fear of obloquy, reproach, contempt, and ridicule which predominate in the natural timidity of his disposition. To remove this irrational dread, and to strengthen his mind in the *true* Catholic Church, I have sent him to Mr. Smith (under whose care he was some years at Eltham), who is most affectionately interested in all his welfare. I will not flatter you or myself that this fear may soon be conquered ; but if he can be suffered to pass this term without an absolute and irrevocable exclusion, I dare confidently entertain the hope, that by or even before Easter term shall commence, he will assume

* The Abbé Beaumont, who, however, according to the victim of "the plot", had no hand in it.

courage to restore himself, with your permission; and in the whole tenor of his future life gratefully repay the extraordinary indulgence he will have received: which hope can only restore tranquillity to him who has the honour to be, dear sir, with all attachment of respect, esteem, and regard,

Your most obliged and obedient servant,

H. WALDO SIBTHORP.

Mr. Smith must have been remarkably persuasive, as by the end of the month the "restored demy" wrote to his President to thank him for his leniency regarding his offence "against every rule and discipline of his College", and to express his hope of deserving the President's kindness.

He assures him of the total change in his opinions and the entire eradication of every error in religion that he had suffered to take root in his mind, and hopes that his attachment to the Church of England may be strengthened by his experience "of the errors of its most ancient, and even now one of its most inveterate, enemies", though that experience has been, he says, "dearly bought by the misery inflicted on my family and the sacrifice of my character and credit".

Six weeks later he wrote to one of the priests (the name is not given) who had attempted to make him a Catholic, as follows:

Rev. Sir,—In reply to the principal contents of your note, I must beg to state that I desire no further communication on the subject of religion may take place between us. Confirmed by a closer examination and more unprejudiced inquiry in the possession of that faith in which I was born and bred, it is my determination, by the aid of the Almighty, to live and die a firm though unworthy member of the Established Church of this country. I again beg that this my settled decision may stop any further communication on your part. With best wishes for your happiness, both temporal and eternal, I remain, etc.

But spiritual conflicts, as his biographer acutely remarks, leave wounds whose cure, like that of bodily ones, depends on the patient's constitution and the wisdom and thoroughness of the treatment employed.

The scar may heal for the time, only to reopen, and this was the case here.

He seemed healed, and fit for the Church's service ; and in that service he was soon to appear as a doughty warrior, but he was not *cured* ; the wound was to break out again. He ceased for a time from Roman association, but the process left him as little an English Churchman as he had been before.

Thrown back amongst those who had already failed to satisfy his longings, he flung himself, his biographer says, as a natural result, "on the crest of the rising wave of the Evangelical movement", whose keynote was pious zeal, a quality stigmatized by its opponents in the Church of England as "enthusiasm".

His first ministry was certainly conducted on lines the exact opposite of "High and Dry" methods, when as a deacon of twenty-three he became curate of Waddington with Harmston, two villages near his old home. Though he only spent a year there

the effects of his ministrations have continued there till the present day (1880), for he preached with all the enthusiasm of a Whitefield. . . . An ear-witness speaks thus : "The youngest, the oldest, the most ignorant were all held in wrapt [sic] attention, and for a long time, too. Beginning almost in a whisper, with what fervid eloquence would he close ! One of his hearers can now distinctly recall special sentences of an address at a school-feast at Harmston though at the time of hearing it she was only six years old."

His success in the pulpit seems to have gone to his head. Not content with the large crowds he drew to the two small churches in his charge, "he went preaching everywhere—nay, even condescending to expound the Scripture in private houses, and those sometimes the houses of Wesleys"—which at that time must have seemed odd indeed. Mr. Fowler excuses him thus :

When a young man, even though he be "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost", finds himself all at once a power for good ; when he sees that by God's grace his gifts and endowments are so blest in their exercise that they *at once evoke a sort of electric response*

[*italics mine*], and that souls are converted to God; is it to be wondered at if at times he is carried away by his zeal so as to overstep the limits of discretion?

His Bishop, however, took a different view, and expressed it in a severe rebuke. The culprit's full apology was not sufficient to wipe out the bad impression such excessive zeal had made, and it was by no means easy for him to get the testimonials necessary for his ordination to the Anglican priesthood. One of those he managed to obtain described him as "good but queer". However, he was given a title by the then incumbent of St. Mary's, Hull, where once more his ministry, though short, was "conspicuously brilliant and useful"; and once again we learn that it was the "solemnity of his manner" in public addresses and the "charm of his social intercourse" which "has never been forgotten".

Before he had been there a year he was given the living of Tattershall, in his own county, and his farewell sermon, published by request, apparently contained a complete confession of the preacher's faith in 1819. The views he held at that date "in regard to the two sacraments" drew a rueful comment from Mr. Fowler. "The one," he says, "is almost deprecated; the other, wonderful though it may seem nowadays (i.e. 1879),* is altogether ignored. Prayer and the study of the Scriptures are spoken of as the only 'means of grace'." That his orthodoxy was considered doubtful by many of his contemporaries is shown by the unusual step he found himself obliged to take in order to secure his election to a Fellowship at Magdalen in the same year. He obtained a letter of commendation from the Hull clergy, countersigned by the Archbishop of York testifying "to his character as a minister of the Established Church" and to his sincere attachment to it. This letter, coupled with those written by him to one of the Fellows and to the President, seems to have overborne his opponents, and he was duly elected.

From Tattershall he went to London, where he spent

* The great debt Anglican sacramental doctrine owes to the Tractarians is clearly shown by Mr. Fowler's comment.

the next four years as a popular preacher attached to various proprietary chapels—an experience which did much to spoil the convert long before his conversion. Its effects both on body and mind account for much that came after.

These chapels [Mr. Fowler says], which at that day existed in certain parts of London . . . were among the chief centres of Evangelical influence; those who attended them (and, it may be added, those who ministered in them) were more or less marked men. . . . For one like him, such association was singularly unfortunate. The mere “popular preacher”, the fashionable caterer for somewhat worldly audiences in quest of religious sensation, may not necessarily be of a nature refined enough to feel outraged by the inevitable commercialism of such chapels. . . . But in such an atmosphere R. Sibthorp must have suffered. It was, to say the least of it, a bad training in the matter of English Churchmanship, and could only end, *under his circumstances*, in repulsion and reaction.

A more worldly minded man would have suffered less, at any rate as regards the nervous strain due to overwork; but his genuine love of souls obliged him to combine pastoral visitation (“he believed much in the effects of a home visit”) with the pseudo-religious social engagements which beset a fashionable preacher, in a way which “involved great and severe demands on his strength of body and mind”.

These demands he met so persistently and even recklessly during all his London ministry that his powers were taxed to the utmost. “‘He has gone’, says one, ‘through St. Giles’s at all hours’”; and in 1826 his health gave way for a time. After his recovery, unfortunately for his future mental stability, he soon became

as prodigal of his health as before his illness. Dr. Farr told him distinctly, “If you go on as you are doing, your mind must give way”; but he only answered, “Then I will die on the pulpit steps.” The words of the doctor were not too severe in their warning utterance, for we hear of Mr. Sibthorp needing to be moved to the house of Mr. William Forster for a little rest, and being in such a state of nervous excitement that his friends became really alarmed. The brain was so strained and overworked that

rest and sleep became almost impossible, and the mind preyed on itself. We may hope that, after all, wiser counsels prevailed, though we do not hear of much remission of labour.

In addition to the duties entailed by his acknowledged position as one of the leaders of the London Evangelicals, he was again the prey of clerical lion-hunting, in the peculiar form which causes a certain type of hostess to invite popular preachers to convert her guests just as another pays large sums to musical stars so as to entertain them with a private concert in her house. Even before he came to London he was once thus exploited by a lady whose house was too small to hold the friends she invited to hear him, whereupon their undaunted hostess led her guests to the barn, where he addressed them. But in London the snares of the hunter were even more cleverly set.

Even at meals, such a clergyman was not safe. Mr. Sibthorp had been invited to dine at the town house of the old Lord — ; and during dinner he was informed, to his discomfiture, that the countess had asked some friends of congenial sentiments to come that night to a drawing-room meeting, at which he was expected to give an exposition ! “And, sure enough,” said he, “they began to assemble ; and the continuous rings at the door-bell quite took away my appetite. When we went upstairs after dinner, there was the drawing-room with its occupants, a table with a Bible on it, and a chair for me. I sat down and began ; I remembered *nothing* of it afterwards ! I was told I had done admirably ; but I resolved I should never do so again.”

An even stranger instance of the dangers he ran as “a mere ‘Popular preacher’ ” was the theft of his miniature from the Somerset House Exhibition during the private view open only to Royalty and the ladies and gentlemen-in-waiting. Ten years later it was returned with an anonymous letter to the effect that the party had been “tempted by Satan to take it, and blessed God for grace to return it”.

But though in 1829 he shook himself free of his London engagements and went to reside for some time at Magdalen College on his Fellowship, the Oxford Sibthorp (to quote Mr. Gladstone) was as popular a

preacher there as in London. His sermons at Bagley Wood and in some of the Oxford churches drew crowds to hear him. At St. Peter-in-Eastgate it is said they filled the church, taking turns to sit or stand, and even "hung like bees at the windows" when he officiated there during the absence of the incumbent. He bought a house close by, with a view to becoming curate there; but "while many were edified" by his sermons some complained and the absent incumbent "was desired by the Bishop to do his own duty or to find a curate, but Mr. Sibthorp's services were declined".

Mr. Gladstone remembered hearing him preach "an Evangelical sermon of a genial type" to the congregation of St. Ebbe's. (Their vicar, Mr. Bulteel, evidently thought it *too* genial, as in his own sermon, preached that very afternoon, he "rebuked the error of saying Christ died for all men, as in the morning his 'brother Sibthorp' had mistakenly taught them".)*

The impression made on Mr. Gladstone by "the Oxford Sibthorp" is interesting—"a soothing general recollection, a venerable visual image in the mind's eye, and a moral certainty that the preaching was, at the least, of singular grace and charm". His biographer insists, however, "that amongst his crowds of admirers were not a few individual souls whom he was the means of bringing back to God".

After his rebuff at Oxford he went in the spring of 1830 to Ryde, where he bought a proprietary chapel, St. James's (now a parish church), under licence from the Bishop of Winchester, and remained its incumbent for the eleven years which were still to elapse before, at the age of fifty, he took the step from which he had been forcibly withheld when he was a boy of nineteen.

He lived in lodgings during his first two years in Ryde and then took a house, which he furnished from his old home, where he remained for a time before buying about twenty acres of land a mile or two from Ryde, on which he built a house called Holmewood, which gave scope for his love of landscape gardening. His old

* Letter from Mr. Gladstone to the Rev. J. Fowler dated London, 25 July, 1879, vide *Life*, pp. 45, 46.

housekeeper, still alive when the *Life* was written, delighted to tell how the house was two years in building, and how her master planned and laid out the conservatories, the serpentine walk, etc., in the beautiful grounds ; from which "six or seven gardeners, with other occasional helpers, went trooping home at night". (It is hardly surprising that later on he found "his health required more attention than was possible in the clergy house" of St. Chad's Cathedral ; and that after a short time the Spoilt Convert "settled down, with his faithful attendant from Ryde, in a 'several house' at Edgbaston".)

After his death some of those who had benefited by his ministry at Ryde testified to its usefulness. One recalled "numerous conversions, chiefly among the higher orders", but also among "the *footmen* of worldly families who used not merely to hear and profit by the sermons, but to buy and read the books of the incumbent of St. James's". Another (probably one of those young officers now grown old) wrote :

Young officers and midshipmen . . . detained for weeks at Portsmouth . . . on Sundays they would come to St. James's and hear Mr. Sibthorp. At first they lounge in their seats with that secular air which too many English *young gentlemen* adopt in the presence of God. Perhaps they think the sermon long—for Mr. Sibthorp might sometimes preach for an hour. But by God's blessing it tells its tale, and whereas the first time they had no service-book of any kind in their hands, at the next service perhaps there would be a Prayer-book, then a Bible, lastly, even a hymn-book, and it not seldom ended in some seeking a private interview with the preacher for spiritual guidance.

His biographer thinks that 1837 saw the beginning of the Romeward journey ; and as so much of his vacillation, all through his life, seems to have been a sign of ill-health, it is interesting to note that he became a Catholic at the end of what an old friend called "his best and halcyon days". His fertility of production, his capacities for exertion, the unusual absence of fussiness over his health, all showed a new vigour partly due "to the necessity of taking much exercise, for he would keep no carriage, and Holmewood was at least a mile (!) from Ryde".

His Sunday services became more frequent. "On Sunday he lived in his church. He used to leave Holme-wood at 7 a.m. and not return till 9 or 10 p.m. At 8 a.m. he had latterly, at least, an early Celebration. Then at 11 a.m. there was the usual morning service, etc. In the afternoon he had a children's service and in the evening there was full Evensong." He also had services on Tuesday and Thursday evenings, and the Friday meetings at his house evidently continued till he left, as the following extract from the account already quoted shows :

As regards Mr. Sibthorp's change of views, which led ultimately to his joining the Church of Rome, I do not feel competent to say much. They came upon him, I think, very gradually. Those who attended his Friday evening meetings were privy to his changing sentiments before they were made public from the pulpit. The first notice that I can remember of it was in his advocating very earnestly the unity of the Church, and insisting upon its necessity. "For how," said he, "could an Epistle be sent to the Church in Manchester? To whom could it be addressed?" I feel sure he had no idea that these views would lead him to Rome, for once, when he was maintaining some of them, I said to him, "If, sir, you honestly hold these views, they must lead you to Rome," he smiled, and said, "You are much mistaken. I believe from prophecy that Romanism is to make head again, and that this [the Puseyite] party is raised up to put it down."

With "his adoption of these views, he began an expensive adornment of his church and the establishment of a surpliced choir", which at that date—1838—was tantamount to the adoption of vestments in an evangelical church of today. But though his ministry at Ryde was not only the most useful but the happiest of his life, till then (and he was now nearing fifty) "there was a constant struggle going on within, and to some extent division among his old friends and adherents".

Light is thrown on the cause of this inner conflict, as well as on the reasons his Anglican friends believed to account for his second "defection" in 1865, in a letter written on hearing of it by an old friend, the Rev. John Noble Coleman, whom he had known since their undergraduate days. Mr. Coleman was incumbent at Ventnor when the Ryde ministry began and had witnessed all the

crossings of the chasm, even the earliest attempt, checked at the very brink, when both were young.

"We began life together", Mr. Sibthorp wrote to him in 1871, "in our examinations at the same time at Oxford . . . we are now nearing the end of it together." Their affectionate correspondence (hitherto unpublished and now in my possession) continued whether, to quote Mr. Coleman, his friend were "in or out of Rome" till death ended it in 1874.

Mr. Coleman had seen a report in the *Record* that Mr. Sibthorp had "returned to the mystic Babylon" from which, as his friend put it, "by God's grace you once escaped", and had written to ask for a contradiction of this report. Two subsequent letters from Mr. Sibthorp had come with no allusion whatever to the subject, a characteristic shirking from uttering disagreeable facts. Meanwhile, "undoubted information from two quarters" had caused his Anglican friends to give up hope of keeping him, and Mr. Coleman wrote again to express their grief in a letter which gives valuable testimony to the causes, in their opinion, of both "defections".

The passage runs :

Whether in or out of Rome we love you for your work's sake and for what God has wrought by you. We mourn your fall from Evangelical reformation truth, which once you preached, and which, while you preached it, was owned and blessed of God. But poisoned by baptismal regeneration instilled by one now robed in lawn [Bishop Wilberforce], you adopted high churchism first and Romanism as the necessary consequent afterwards. Before this change, your fleece was wet with the dew of heaven. After this change your fleece was dry and dewless. Poison has again been dropt into your ear by one high in intellect and high in Papal rank [Cardinal Wiseman], but robed in the Devil's livery and doing the Devil's work.

The remark about his dry and dewless fleece contains an unintentional clue to the reason for his inexplicable return to Anglicanism in 1843, so short a time after being raised to the priesthood by Cardinal Wiseman. It is evident that his second Anglican ministry was a disappointment to his friends and admirers, and that they

attributed the change in him to his few months in the Catholic Church. But the principal reason for that swift desertion and for the change his friends noticed after his return to them was identical.

Both were mainly due to a dangerous accident, in which both spine and brain received serious injury, which befell him within three months of his becoming a priest. He was thrown violently out of a carriage on to a heap of stones, and the subsequent illness was severe and its effects lasting. "His Birmingham co-religionists", Mr. Fowler rather scornfully says, "were fain to ascribe his desertion to some mental injury resulting from his accident"—they were better psychologists, apparently, than his biographer realized.

But long before the accident, in the best of his halcyon days, the same strange irresolution, the same timidity, not to say cowardice, seem to have characterized the man of fifty, respected, admired, consulted, as it had the undergraduate of nineteen. For when he had at last determined to "bridge the chasm", he made his friend and confidant, Dr. Bloxam, an unsuspecting accessory before the fact by getting him to write to Dr. Wiseman and arrange an interview for him. The reason he gave was that he wished to consult Dr. Wiseman about a member of his congregation who either was, or was about to be, "a seceder from the Church of England to that of Rome".

Dr. Bloxam had naturally no idea that Mr. Sibthorp would use such a subterfuge with an intimate friend, and did so, "little suspecting what the result would be". The answer, "Rev. and dear sir, I shall be most happy to receive Mr. Sibthorp on the day you mention", was dated St. Mary's College (Oscott) Festival St. Peter Alcant: (19 October), 1841. He went to Oscott "and returned to Oxford in a few days, looking worn and agitated" (as he well might at the prospect of meeting a friend whom he had treated so disingenuously), "and no longer a member of the Church of England".

He then returned to Ryde, said good-bye to his friends there, sold his house and grounds, part of his library, and St. James's Chapel; after which he went to Oscott to

study for Orders. Mr. Fowler says that the fascination it exercised on him "was *never* dispelled", and in after-years he would often draw a contrast between the religious tone of Oscott and Oxford, and always to the disadvantage of the latter. "The place appeared to him more religious than even his own loved Magdalen." Its old President had always been his true friend, and Dr. Routh, a man not easily moved, burst into tears as he read Sibthorp's touching letter of farewell, assuring him that his prayer would ever be "Floreat Magdalena", to Dr. Bloxam.

An entry on the fly-leaf of Mr. Sibthorp's missal shows that he was received into the Church by Dr. Wiseman on 27 October, 1841, given minor Orders on Ember Saturday in Advent of that year, the Sub-diaconate on 19 February, 1842, the Diaconate on 13 March, 1842, and the Priesthood on 21 May following.

The importunity of his friends compelled him before he had been three months in the Church himself to publish the two pamphlets by which he expected to answer the question "Why are you become a Catholic?" It is hardly surprising that "they were rather trenchantly answered at the time by several hands, and, what is more important, the author himself confessed that the arguments used were unsatisfactory to himself", a fact which was taken by Anglican friends to mean that no satisfactory ones existed. The second pamphlet appeared in answer to objections made to the first by the Rev. W. Palmer and the Rev. W. Dodsworth, both of whom became Catholics a few years later. Dodsworth, with an acuteness the next year was to justify, said in his *Reply*: "You are only half a Romanist."

The two pamphlets, Mr. Fowler says, contained :

passages of characteristic earnestness and eloquent declamation, bits of the quaint illustrations in which he delighted, vivid description of fears, with touching reference to his isolation and to sufferings for conscience' sake foreseen and even now in part realized, but the "judicial mind" was conspicuously wanting.

The following passages from a letter in reply to an old friend, the Rev. G. Quilter, furnish not only "a more agreeable view of his feelings than can be gathered from

controversial writings", but a far more harmless one than arguments based on what could not yet be profound knowledge of his new Faith.

He writes (from Oscott, 26 December, 1841) :

My Dear Friend,

Your signature afforded me real pleasure ; and the sentiments you express did not surprise me. I have always much valued your friendship, which I knew to be sincere ; nor do I value it less because you candidly, and yet kindly, condemn the step I have lately taken. I would rather that the righteous should "smite me friendly and reprove me" than have the "precious balms" of the wicked . . .

No personal experience can have much weight with another to convey conviction of his being in the right course ; but it has some with the person himself. It is a sort of private testimony, the force of which he, and he alone, can understand properly. I assure you my change of religion makes as yet no change in my sentiments or affections towards my friends. I am not compelled to utter any anathemas against any ; and I have none in my heart ; and while I would that all men were even as I myself, I am free from supposing that the Catholic Church monopolizes all the Divine Mercy.

After his Ordination in 1842 he was attached to St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham, where Mr. Fowler says "his preaching necessarily formed a great attraction, an advantage his new allies did not spare to use". An old friend who then lived at Edgbaston says :

He refused to live with the clergy, and took a small house, and spent his time chiefly in visiting the poor. He preached a great deal (taking into the pulpit with him a pocket Bible), and generally without a trace of Romanism ; and he joined in few ceremonies. He was spoken of as the "spoilt convert", whom to retain much must be conceded.

He gave £1000 towards the completion of St. Barnabas, Nottingham, where he took a house ; as he expected, for some unstated reason, to be sent there "to do priestly work". It is possible that his unsettlement was partly due to pique, which (as a letter of March 1866 seems to show) played no small part in his return to Anglicanism. Mr. Fowler says :

It seems certain that, during his recovery from his accident, something was said or done towards him which deepened the misgivings which, to a nature like his, must always have been more or less present since his sudden change in 1841.

In October 1842 he writes again to Mr. Quilter, telling him that his surgeon believes that his fall, "though a fearful one, prevented a much more serious illness hanging over him" (a medical opinion which sounds as if its aim was to quiet the patient's nerves) by bringing it out in another form. He ends the letter :

I excuse your harsh words against the Catholic Church. I wish we had not given you reason to say anything against us. But do not lay the faults of her members on the Church itself. However, I am sick and weary of controversy ; I would know but one thing—Christ crucified ; and I do find I am in a position to learn Him if it be not my own fault.

The following June (1843) he left Edgbaston and bought a cottage near St. Helen's in the Isle of Wight, where

he continued to exercise his priesthood in a small chapel or oratory fitted up in his own house ; to which the Roman Catholics of the neighbourhood used to resort till, through the carelessness of an altar boy, the chapel caught fire, and its valuable contents—pictures, prints, silver plate, altar-linen, etc., destroyed.

In any case they would soon have been useless, as on 2 October he sent Dr. Routh a letter truly surprising from a man who up to a few weeks earlier had "exercised his priesthood" :

I should think myself wanting in duty and gratitude if I did not write to you, and be myself the first to communicate what, I hope, will have your approbation. I resolved in Lent last to go into retirement, that I might leisurely reconsider the step I took (certainly hastily) in joining the Church of Rome. I came here in June last, and the result of much consideration and most painful and anxious reflection—not, I hope, without hearty prayer to God to guide me right—has been that yesterday morning (October 1) I received the Holy Communion in the parish church of this village, as declaratory of my return to the Church of England. I

will not trouble you with my reasons for this step ; but neither will I conceal from you that it has cost me an intensely severe struggle to satisfy myself as to the duty of returning to a Church which, though, as it seems to me, free from the adulteration of truth, is not in some points (by no means unimportant) in such accordance with the primitive Church of Christ as I could wish her to be. I have been obliged to rest a good deal on this conclusion, that *perfection* is not to be looked for, and that, in the present broken and divided state of Christendom, freedom from positive error is what one must be satisfied with. If I must choose one to be united with, there can be no question where the choice must be, between an adulteress, which I verily regard the Church of Rome, and one who, though wanting in not a few embellishments and agreeable endowments (to say the least), is yet chaste and true and faithful. But I will not further enter on the subject. It will be much gratification to me to know that you think I have acted right in this step.

I should be glad to be allowed to receive the Holy Communion in Magdalen College Chapel, either when it is next administered there or at Christmas, if not judged by you improper. I wish, where I may have given offence, to make the act of reparation quietly and unostentatiously.

To the Rev. E. Bickersteth, on 5 October he wrote words even more inconsistent with his action in building less than four months earlier an oratory in which he could, and did, say Mass according to the rites of an idolatrous Church. The only explanation of such conduct is that the injury to spine and brain, from the effects of which he was still suffering, had entirely upset his mental balance.

The letter included this passage : "The conviction I am come to, after most painful deliberation, is that the Church of Rome is the harlot and Babylon in the Apocalypse. I believe her to be an adulteress and idolatrous Church, especially as it respects Mariolatry", language he later deeply regretted, and attempted to explain away in a letter to Dr. Bloxam, dated 27 March, 1866, after his return to the Church, which states :

I have placed a copy in your correspondence of my letter to Edward Bickersteth in 1843. I had rather that letter was consigned to entire oblivion. The perfectly truthful history of it is this. I returned to the Isle of Wight not quite satisfied with one or two

matters in the Catholic Church, but more dissatisfied with some circumstances respecting my own (then) destination to Nottingham. You may remember you visited me at St. Helen's. The Isle of Wight produced its effect (so much felt by many) on me. I became feeble and nervous, enfeebled in mind and body. I was shut out from nearly all Catholic Society, and from church except the little room I fitted up in my house. I became morbid, and unhappy, and relaxed, and dispirited, and began to look at everything in the Catholic Church through such spectacles as this state of mind and body fitted for my use. In this state I wrote to Bickersteth a letter intended as a *private confidential* communication. But he immediately after went to Bath, and at a Church Missionary meeting there *read out my letter*, which of course stirred all waters, brought on me sharp abuse from the sharp pen of Frederick Lucas in the *Tablet*, and all sorts of questionings and cross-questionings from High Church and Low Church Protestants or Anglicans, and earnest endeavours to get me to write to the newspapers, etc. But I never would nor did; for which I got abused most violently. I don't know that I have right to complain of this letter having been so used, but I wish it unwritten most earnestly.

His mental instability is shown in a letter of November 1843, in which he explained that notwithstanding his return to the Anglican Communion, he was not prepared to say Anathema to much of what Protestants consider Roman dogma.* He says :

I still praise, and, unless I come to see things very differently, shall praise, the Catholic Church for her daily devotions, etc. Yes, my mind upon all these subjects is unaltered. But as yet I dare not retrace the step I have taken; and I trust, as you justly and devoutly observe, that my reasons, if they remain, may be found just and weighty when we shall appear at the tribunal of God.

"Notwithstanding these reservations," Mr. Fowler says, "he considered that his rupture with the Church of Rome was definite", and wrote "very strongly" to Dr. Routh to tell him so and to express his desire, should the President approve, to be again connected with his College. (This desire remained unfulfilled till 1848, when he was once more exercising his Anglican ministry.) Meanwhile in 1845 he went to Winchester, where he approached his former bishop with a request for re-

* *Life*, p. 78.

admission to the "ministerial offices of a clergyman of the Church of England in the diocese of Winchester".

Bishop Sumner's reply is interesting. The summary of it in the *Life* is as follows :

The Bishop, after expressing his thankfulness to God for Mr. Sibthorp's wish to return to his ministerial functions, told him that he must call upon him for such an explicit declaration, especially in regard to the principal points of difference between the English and Roman Churches, as could alone justify him in becoming a party to his readmission to the post of teacher. He told him that, if he furnished him with such a document he intended to submit it to the Archbishop of Canterbury, without whose full concurrence he should not act. Mr. Sibthorp, in his reply, asked that the points on which satisfaction was required should be put before him in a definite form : but before anything could be done, the Bishop wrote a second letter, stating that he had heard that Mr. Sibthorp was in the habit of frequenting Roman Catholic services : and, referring to one instance, asked whether it was true or not. His informant was a Roman Catholic priest.

The result speaks for itself. Mr. Sibthorp, without referring at all to the charge brought against him, begged leave to withdraw his application. His resentment at the Bishop's request is expressed in a long letter to Dr. Routh, certain points of which throw some light on that unquenchable love for the Church which no amount of Protestant argument could completely eradicate.

He complains that while he was prepared to subscribe to the Articles (which Tract XC had, no doubt, convinced him were capable of a Catholic interpretation) and Liturgy, he was asked to give a more satisfactory proof of his adherence to Anglican doctrine. This would either oblige him to go beyond the Articles in a declaration against the Church of Rome or it would not. If not, to what purpose would such a declaration be ? If so, could any bishop be warranted in asking it ? His regret that he had called the Bishop's requirements "vague" was characteristic of his ingrained courtesy, for : "I do indeed, my dear Mr. President, think it was so. For into what points, or what topics of the controversy between England and Rome, was I to go in this 'document' ?"

He also felt it unfair that other Anglican clergymen had been "readmitted to officiate" on ceasing to be Catholics without any such extra assurances as the Bishop required of him, and also that no notice was taken of his offer to answer any questions the Bishop chose to ask. He did not consider that his "frequenting Roman Catholic services" justified this refusal to question him personally, though the Bishop's obvious wish "to have it in writing" seems not unnatural! He felt sure that injurious tales from some quarter were prejudicing the Bishop against him, and ended a very long letter with a passage which gives a clear glimpse into the Spoilt Convert's mentality.

I felt I required sympathy with the difficulties and trials of my own mind from whoever received me back to the ministry of the Church of England; and that he should rather be one who could say, "Conscientiously subscribe all that is required of necessity, and that shall suffice", than one who would search into points about which, while conscientiously subscribing such formularies, I might still feel anxieties—e.g. prayers for the dead. That, having continued for three years a communicant of the Church of England, as well as a worshipper in her communion, and professing now my readiness to give the subscription she requires for her ministry, my case was fairly to be judged by these circumstances; by the fact also of my having left the communion of the Church of Rome at sacrifices, which might easily be inferred, of reputation, ease, and friendship (I withstood temptations occurring powerfully during those three years, especially at the time of the secession to her of other clergymen, to return to the communion of Rome), and not by any occasional act of indiscretion, which might after all be attributed to many other motives than any wrong attachment to the Church of Rome. That, in short, though I was prepared and conscious to myself of the most honest intention to labour faithfully in the Church of England as a clergyman of that Church and as her accredited servant, I was not prepared to be dealt with other than tenderly and gently as respected the position I had just quitted, as a minister, an ordained presbyter, of another branch, however corrupt, of Christ's Catholic Church: and I gathered that the Bishop of Winchester (I saw it with every feeling of true respect, both for the office and the individual) was not the person who could so deal with me.

He now turned to his old diocese of Lincoln, at that time "under the genial and benevolent, yet very effective,

administration of the learned Bishop Kaye", and lived for some time near Nottingham, where he was much distressed by the poverty of its people, though he confesses, in a letter to Dr. Routh in February 1847, he is *not* of opinion that the trade depression which caused it was "a chastisement sent upon us for the measures lately passed in relief of the Roman Catholics". Once more he refers to his spiritual affinities :

I am sure it will gratify you to know that I feel, more than I have ever yet been, confirmed in my decision to abide within the English communion, if she will permit me. I do not repent my return to her in 1843, notwithstanding the repulse I have received from the Bishop of Winton, who, I think, may possibly have been misinformed on some matters. While I acknowledge a sympathy with some of the doctrines of the Roman Church, with many of her ceremonies and with much of her discipline, I do most conscientiously believe the Church of England to be doctrinally purer, more Scriptural, and more in accordance with true Catholic practice as witnessed by the primitive Church.

And on 23 March he tells Dr. Routh :

I am shortly to remove to Lincoln for residence, with the hope that the Bishop may concede to me what his brother of Winchester would not. At least, I consider it a duty to repeat the attempt to be restored to my office as a clergyman of the Anglican Church. If I am not, the fault, if there be any, shall not be with me.

In May he tells Dr. Bloxam that he is making every effort to obtain readmission into the Church of England, else he will be in great perplexity (probably because he was building St. Anne's Bede-houses and had dreams of a chapel attached where he would act as chaplain), and wonders if the President, when better, could be asked to further him in any way with the Primate.

Soon after he writes again, accusing the "*Tablet, Record, Church and State Gazette*, etc.", of false reports in which he can trace a strong attempt to get him "back into the Church of Rome or out of the Church of England". In June he writes to Dr. Bloxam again :

Matters remain *in statu quo*. The Bishop of Lincoln, in a very civil communication to my eldest brother, observes : "One peculiarity in his (my) case is that he published his reasons for

seceding from our communion and joining that of Rome. He ought, therefore, in my opinion, to give equal publicity to his reasons for returning to our Church." I altogether differ from his Lordship, and for very many reasons, with which I will not trouble you. . . . In withdrawing from Rome, I never meant to become her hostile opponent. The quietest course possible, I am clear without a doubt, is the properest under my circumstances ; I will take no other, God helping me, be the result what it may. I shall not wonder if this proves the decisive hitch. The Bishops want more from one than the law of the land and the rules of the Church warrant them to ask ; and *I will not give it.*

And in November he writes once more, "My own health and peace of mind demand a settlement some way", ending with the complaint that the Church of England has no compassion, no feeling, no forgiveness.

But whether his rules for the inmates of St. Anne's Bede-houses were considered a guarantee, or whether Dr. Routh's good offices had brought it about, three days after the Bede-house Trustees held their first half-yearly meeting (20 December, 1847), he wrote to tell Dr. Routh that the Bishop of Lincoln had informed him that he was at liberty to officiate and preach in the English Church once more.

The Bishop's permission was given after consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who at first insisted on the publication of a written retraction, but finally was content with the following letter from Mr. Sibthorp to the Bishop being entered in the register of the diocese :

My Lord.—In the autumn of 1841 I quitted the communion of the Church of England for that of Rome. The step was a hasty and erroneous one, taken without due and prayerful consideration. The reasons which I soon after published, under the title of "An Answer to the Inquiry, Why are you become a (Roman) Catholic ?" I consider to have been altogether insufficient to justify the step, and I deeply regret their publication. Nor have I seen any reasons put forth by those who, either lately or at any former period, have quitted the Church of England for that of Rome or any other communion which appear to me to justify them in so doing. I consider the Church of England to be, as regards her doctrines, government, and formularies, a sound and healthful portion of Christ's Holy Catholic Church ; worthy of all respect for the truth's sake that is in her, and of the faithful adherence of all her

members; and with whose existence and welfare are bound up, not only the best interests of our own land, but of the world at large—in fact, the glory of God, in the happiness and salvation of man, by the efficacious influence of the religion and kingdom of Jesus Christ.

“Very fitly”, Mr. Fowler says, “did his restoration synchronize with the realization of the Bede-house scheme”, and as the Bede-houses were his main pre-occupation for the years between 1847, when in his fifty-sixth year he began his second Anglican ministry, and 1865 when he resumed the life of a Catholic priest, it may be well to describe them briefly. They cost him the bulk of his fortune, as he spared no expense in the building, whose architecture was “put into excellent hands”, those of the elder Pugin; “for no one at that time was so likely to reconcile thoughtful consideration for the aged with individual grace and beauty”. Unfortunately he refused to build the chapel, added in 1853, at the cost and in the way Mr. Sibthorp wished. (His taste for eclectic effects in colour apparently tried most artists and architects.) With Pugin’s consent the chapel was eventually built to Butterfield’s plans.

Thirteen Bedes-women and one man (whose solitary position one cannot help pitying—was he intended to protect the thirteen ladies from possible burglars?) were housed there, and they were required to be poor, honest Lincolnshire folks, communicants of the Church of England, and natives of, or twenty years resident in, Lincoln itself, or in the parishes of Canwick, Washingborough, Waddington, and Harmston respectively. In 1853, when the chapel was built and the founder became chaplain, he drew up a sort of community rule for them—Communion once a month, so as not to put “a burden on the consciences of the old people”, and Litany with a short sermon on Wednesdays and Fridays. He took great pains with the choir-boys, one of whom “acted as acolyth or ‘server’—a use almost unknown at that time”, for though the services were specially meant for the “Bedes-people” (the unusual term is evidently necessitated by the one man in the community), who were provided with oak stalls in the chancel “as being the

religieuses (the plural gender difficulty is unsurmountable here) of the place", nave accommodation for about 110 persons was added for the benefit of the neighbours.

Till the Bede-houses were started and the chapel open, he seems to have done little else but superintend the buildings and lay out the grounds, as his clerical work was limited to morning duty at St. Peter-at-Arches, and, for a short time, an evening sermon at St. Martin's. After 1853, when he was chaplain, he had a little more definite work, but it is no wonder that with so little to occupy him "his morbid feelings grew and increased, or that to old and attached friends he often uttered a piteous wail", nor that by doing so he gave them reason to think, after his return to the Church, that his unsettlement had been partly due to his living so retired a life and taking so little part in what went on in Lincoln. This he stoutly denied in a letter to Mr. Fowler, in which he says :

As regards business matters, I did take part (until deafness a good deal unfitted me) in the hospital, dispensary, library and other institutions. And I would do so elsewhere if needful. You probably mean that I did not enter into Society. Pardon me if I say (with no condemnation of others), "God keep me from this kind of clerical life."

His biographer, who had been his intimate friend and devoted curate (though what assistance he can possibly have needed is hard to imagine) from 1859 till he succeeded him as Chaplain-warden in 1864, could not bring himself to acknowledge that the morbid feelings and the piteous wails were caused by the homesickness of a prodigal son who had not the courage to return to his true home. But proofs of this are clearly seen in the large number of letters (he "kept up an extensive intercourse by letter with a large circle" and those which have been kept "almost constitute an autobiography") printed in the *Life*. From 1848, the date of the first Lincoln letter quoted by Mr. Fowler, till 1864, when he returned to the Church, hardly one is free from some allusion to Catholicism. Sometimes they show the bitterness of one who is trying to keep a rift from closing, sometimes (very often) a comparison with the Church of England

is made, by no means in favour of the latter ; but it is quite clear that through all those seventeen years, when "he seemed outwardly happy and was certainly eminently useful to others", the struggle never ended ; till the piece of driftwood, as Mr. Fowler calls him, again afloat, was cast up once more on the shores of his heart's true home.

In July 1848, for instance, he writes :

What a noble death has the Archbishop of Paris died ! Well may the Church of Rome glory in such a prelate in these degenerate days ; to die on a barricade preaching peace and seeking to stop bloodshed and reconcile foes ! It is a sort of martyrdom. There were, it is obvious, no wife and children to tender (sic) the mind and make the heroic resolution waver. It is strange that so corrupt a Church should present more, far more, instances of self-sacrifice than our own.

The following year he laments the Anglican disuse of "anointing with oil in the name of the Lord" in connexion with the first death amongst his old Bedes-women, and a little later confesses that though his dislike of "Newman's extreme Roman views" is natural to one who "was always so much a moderate in certain peculiarities of the Roman Church", he believes the extremes he deplores "to be grounded on truths ; truths, too, lost sight of by the Church of England". In another letter he deplores the supine methods of the bishops, apparently in connexion with a day of public prayer and humiliation during the cholera epidemic. "Everything is so disjointed (*disjecta membra*) in the Church of England, that it seems in this matter to drag along its weary length. How differently would the Church of Rome have managed this matter !" ; and in a later one he praises the "mild and unassuming manners of the Roman priesthood, especially among the Regulars, a great contrast to the *unsubdued* tone of the Anglican clergy".

His comment on the Gorham judgement is interesting. He professes himself well satisfied with the decision of the Privy Council, because, the Church of England being by no means consistent in her statements respecting the sacraments, he does "not expect her clergy to be so" ;

nor does he think "her rulers have a right to require them to take one view when the Church has left it open to them to take two or half a dozen views of these great matters". In the same year he laments that his past life has given him such insight into the two great antagonist Churches of this day—those of Rome and England—that he knows not how to find rest for his foot in either. It seems as if all his life his faith was hampered by his instinct to limit it by sight.

The opening of St. Anne's Bede-houses in 1854 occupied his mind, and the next five years, his biographer says, were passed in such quiet ways and amidst such benevolent and devout ministrations that there was nothing definite to record. But signs of the "times of conflict which were soon to follow" began in the letters 1859-61, in which the Spoilt Convert gives glimpses of the return journey.

(To be continued)

THE AMERICAN CHURCH TODAY

FOR a long time now it has been a fashionable sport among us English to go to the United States of America for a few weeks and on our return home to print our views of any (and sometimes every) aspect of American life, not seldom expressing ourselves in such fashion as to betray our indifference to, even ignorance of, the facts that England is not the datum-point of the world and that the United States is not a homogeneous country of the size of Holland. It would seem that an Englishman can gain, in his own land, the reputation of an authority, an expert, even an oracle, on few subjects so easily as on the United States or on some important aspect of the American set-up; and if he has a ready wit his wisecracks will hasten his achievement.

It is obvious that the above paragraph has been written because the writer does not want to be taken for that sort of returned traveller. The following rambling and unco-ordinated observations about the Catholic Church in the United States are reminiscences, things seen and heard recollected in tranquillity, of three months spent within the quadrilateral whose corners are at Boston, Philadelphia, Louisville, Ky., and Saint Cloud, Minn. Within those narrow temporal and geographical limits I saw and heard a good deal (some of which prudence forbids me to write down): to a considerable extent my Catholic "contacts" were hand-picked—that is to say, represented more than a highest common factor of Catholicism in America—but at the same time I was in touch with the "rank and file" and with non-Catholics as well.

Catholics form the biggest single religious denomination in the United States, more than a seventh of the total population, and this means that they "count" in a way we do not in this country. This can be seen at once in the secular newspapers, wherein news that in England would be unnoticed, or hardly noticed, outside the Catholic papers, is fully reported in prominent positions. Nor is this reporting confined to news that it is pleasant to see there: the Church in U.S.A. is far from being

without internal troubles, and I have before me as I write a cutting from a New York paper that gives a devastatingly frank account of a brawl arising out of an ecclesiastical disturbance in a neighbouring state. It is a corollary that the Church should bulk far more in the consciousness of a non-Catholic American than of an Englishman—though whether he generally sees her as we should wish is another matter. I am afraid he does not. Conversation with non-Catholics showed me that they tend to associate the Church with groups of people that have imported their European nationalist particularisms into America, with the political activities and influence of some of her members, with “low-grade immigrants”, with the idea of a highly organized and wealthy property-owning organization, with a *weltanschauung* whose consonance with “American ideals” cannot be relied upon—rarely did they see her as a religious force, as an association of people which, whatever the shortcomings of those people individually, exists solely to perpetuate the teaching and example of Jesus Christ upon earth. Less rarely, a little less rarely, they recognized the Church as an ethical force. Sometimes, for example, there was appreciation of the controlling part Catholics played in “cleaning up the movies” and of the “moral urge” in such characters as Father Coughlin and Dorothy Day—but even this was associated with individuals rather than with the American Church at large, most of whose members seemed to them to have standards differing but little from those of their non-Catholic neighbours.

Among such critics the Church’s stand on such matters as divorce and birth-prevention is not counted to her for righteousness. They point to acre after acre of apartment-houses and pertinently ask: “How *can* people living there have children?” And there are married Catholics to be met who “practise” both their religion and birth-prevention, and do not feel called on to apologize for either.

Mr. Shane Leslie has recently written that English Catholics “never count as a national force because they are so divided on every subject except the Creed”. If that be true, it is a terrifying thought that we have

succeeded in so isolating "the Creed" from our practical intelligence, as it were sterilizing it and keeping it in a compartment labelled "Religion". Yet, allowing for different circumstances, one is tempted to make a similar judgement on America: to say, when told that one person in every six or seven is a Catholic, a total of twenty million souls, "I shouldn't have thought it. How can so much leaven have so little effect?" For, due allowance being made for economic conditions, standard of living, climate and the rest, the United States as a whole strikes the outside observer as pretty thoroughly materialistic, "atheistic for practical purposes"—as unwilling as are countries with less clamant ideals to apply the maxim *fiat iustitia ruat coelum*, to recognize "the primacy of the spiritual".* It is certainly not for lack of personal goodness and devotion on the part of so many Catholics—and here we approach one of the reasons for their relative ineffectiveness: religion is even more individualistic in America than it is in England. Public worship is the first test of diffused religious quality, and in America the social, mystical aspect of the Mass is in general forgotten; public worship is not a common corporate act but the sum of individual private prayers.

It was in New York that a priest said to me, describing the churches with six, eight, ten crowded public Masses on Sundays and holy days, the communion-rails thronged:

"It frightens me, all that individual devotion, all those very private intentions, without any *conscious* unity or relating oneself to the others and to all the Church. The idea of the Lord's Supper is gone—it has become private prayers *coram Sanctissimo*."

It was a priest in Chicago who said to me:

* It is often said that the Church in her human aspect in U.S.A. shows too great a concern about the cash nexus and "the superiority of the costly". After making the allowances above referred to an outsider can see much that seems to justify the criticism. However, the significant thing about the "tanner-in-the-slot" turnstiles, by means of which two churches in one city much increased their Sunday revenues, is that they were taken away again. Bingo-parties for raising church funds—bingo seems to be the game which in the army we called "house"—have provoked considerable controversy because of the way in which they are often advertised and conducted.

"After I had read the collect this morning I was deeply distressed by the thought that probably nobody in the congregation—except the few who had English missals, and perhaps not even them—understood those words: . . . *ut semper rationabilia meditantes, quae tibi sunt placita et dictis exsequamur et factis.*"

It was another priest in the same city whom I heard tell a public gathering that full churches and numerous communions may be misleading—matters of habit, human respect, spiritual selfishness, unintelligent obedience. The lead in an effort to restore understanding public worship and congregational participation has been taken by the Benedictines of St. John's Abbey in Minnesota (it is significant that this monastery is also a centre of socio-economic enlightenment); progress is slow and localized, but statements such as those quoted above are more and more widely heard.

And they have need to be. The following examples are exceptional, but they are signs of the times and the place. Novenas have recently been a subject of criticism, and of not very convincing replies, in the American *Ecclesiastical Review*; they are often announced as "perpetual", and their popularity leads to such things as "Mass, sermon and novena in twenty-five minutes." This is how it is done: "The sermon is continued up to the consecration, and holy communion is given out immediately following. After the sermon the people sing hymns." Last year a certain diocesan paper announced a novena, giving the preacher's name and the daily schedule of services, *each of twenty-five to thirty minutes*, beginning at 11.50 a.m.:

Thereafter they will be almost continual, at 12.15 with the mid-day Mass, at 12.45 with the second midday Mass, at 1.15, at 3 in the afternoon, etc. . . . Each service will conclude with Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament.

In another city, X——, the printed announcement ran:

Calling all X——! Calling all X—— to return to the Crucified! X——'s famous . . . Novena. Conducted by the Reverend Y—— at the foot of X——'s own miraculous crucifix.

One parish dresses its altar boys in a sort of mediaeval fancy-dress (varied from time to time) and had in its church two rows of canaries in cages, trained to sing when the organ played. This was copied by a struggling church not far off, which soon attracted crowds from afar to its shrine of St. Z——, in which were four canary cages (but a visitor records that in Lent the attendance for Friday "stations" there was about five people). I understand that from both churches the aviaries have now been removed, but not before neighbouring parishes had so felt the drain on their congregations that one of them, as a measure of defence and attraction, put a sweet-smelling perfume in its holy water !*

Then there are "communion breakfasts", which have occasioned several abuses. On these it is sufficient to quote the Jesuit weekly *America*, 1 May, 1937 :

The communion breakfasts started in parish halls and school auditoriums, and in their beginnings were a laudable incentive to foster and promote worthy parish and beneficent organizations. Today, at worst, they look more like propagandized political rallies wherein politicians and social cranks avail themselves of a sympathetic audience of, at times, a few thousands without any cost and under most desirable conditions. At best, the form these communion rallies have taken would seem to be altogether dissident from and repellent to the momentous event that occasions them.

Another factor that weakens the effectiveness and influence of the Church in this country as big as a continent is the variety of national origins of the people. In so far as it is not American (and it is increasingly American) the "flavour" of the Church in U.S.A. is Irish : of 107 bishops-in-ordinary, forty-eight have certainly Irish names, and of the rest at least twenty names are German. Everybody knows the huge numbers of Italians, Poles, Ukrainians, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks and others who have emigrated to America in relatively recent times.

* Should any reader be incredulous of these things he may refer for confirmation to the issues of *Orate Fratres* for December 1937. Nor may England be complacent. The following is from the *Catholic Herald* : "One church which I lately visited has modernized tradition to the extent of neon-lighting a statue. Neatly round our Lady's halo appeared in advertising's best scarlet, 'Immaculate'."

But it is not easy to realize what this means until one has seen the Italian quarter in some big city or visited in the course of an afternoon eight or ten agricultural villages in Minnesota where the Catholic church is almost the only church and, up to less than twenty years ago, German was almost the only language.* It was natural enough that these emigrants should have formed into congregations which should be made "national" parishes with churches in which they could hear sermons and confess themselves in their own tongue. It was natural and right that they should seek to preserve something of their native ways of life and culture—but unfortunately they did more: they brought with them from Europe or imported later, or evolved on the spot, feuds, prejudices, parties, disputes that have been a fruitful source of trouble, ecclesiastical and other. Last autumn I heard many references to a serious schism among the American Poles, some of whom are hankering after a local "national church". Nor does it appear certain that with the passage of time this state of affairs will disappear; that the emergence of generations brought up and living American, speaking only English, will automatically do away with national particularisms so that these Central European *enclaves* will cease to be somewhat apart from the general stream of American Catholic life and so consolidate the effectiveness of the Church. It may be so—but there is tradition to be reckoned with: will not a tradition remain when there is no longer any basis for it in fact?—and an irrational, effete, not-understood tradition can be the root of fanaticism and a potent cause of disorder.†

In some cases there is added to difference of national origin a difference of ecclesiastical rite, which makes the

* The Germans and Scandinavians were the only "foreign" elements of which I did not from time to time hear bitter criticism. German Catholic influence is strong and good.

† The religious history of these immigrations has still to be written. Fifty years ago there were 50,000 Italians in and around New York City; the majority of them "seem never to have learned the elements of Christian doctrine"; not more than 1200 of them ever assisted at Mass; ten of the twelve priests of their nationality had left Italy on account of sexual offences. It was much the same in north-western Pennsylvania. The third plenary council of Baltimore was very much exercised about all this. Cf., Zwierlein, *Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid*, Vol. II. pp. 333-335.

problem even more difficult. There are in the United States well over half a million Byzantine Ruthenians (Ukrainians, Carpatho-Rusins, and others), and some 75,000 other Catholics of Eastern rites. Many of these latter have their own churches and clergy, but all are subject to the local Latin ordinaries, whereas there is a special bishop-in-ordinary for the Ukrainians and another similar bishop for the rest of the Ruthenians. To give even a cursory account of the sad and difficult history of the Catholic orientals in America would require an article in itself. They were poor and for the most part unlettered folk coming from countries where Eastern Catholic practice was normal and understood, not only to a strange land, but to one where their fellow Catholics knew nothing and cared less about their brethern of Eastern rite. The attitude of the generality of the Latin clergy and others who should know better, and this still remains to a considerable extent, is outlined and criticized gently but firmly by Father Desmond Schmal, S.J., in the *Ecclesiastical Review* for November 1937.

Great exception was taken to the orientals' married clergy* and the Holy See so far met the wishes of the American Latin ecclesiastical authorities as to decree that in future only celibate Ruthenian priests should be admitted to or ordained in North America. This caused so many difficulties that it was not strictly enforced, and the reaffirmation of the decree in 1929 caused much discontent among the Carpatho-Rusins, which culminated last year in the excommunication of six priests *nominatim*. These priests are now leaders of a schism, an interesting thing about which is that the malcontents at first claimed to be still in communion with the Holy See and continued to name "our most holy chief bishop, Pius, Pope of Rome" in the Liturgy. It is said that the marriage question is only one element in the trouble, which conceals more domestic differences and interests.

* Says Father Schmal roundly, "It is sometimes said that the married clergy are a scandal to the Latin rite. . . . To whom do the married clergy present an occasion of sin? Surely not to our Latin priests who are bound by the obligation of celibacy? . . . On the other hand, if the married clergy are a scandal to our Latin laity it is only because the latter have not been properly instructed." According to Father Schmal the majority of American Ruthenian priests are married.

As with nationality, so with rite, it would seem that time would bring the solution. On the face of it, when people will have lived for several generations in so thoroughly "Western" a country as America, often have been educated in Latin Catholic schools,* have lost their Slavonic tongue, have attended churches which, albeit Eastern in rite, yet show strongly the effect of Western surroundings on their services and appointments, it seems reasonable that such people will want and should be allowed formally to join the Latin rite. But again, it is not so easy as it looks. To name only one thing: there are large numbers of dissident Orthodox, Russian and other, in U.S.A., and the fundamental thing that keeps them from even considering reunion with the Catholic Church is their conviction that Rome would ultimately deprive them of their age-long Byzantine rites and customs. Were they to see orientals allowed to "turn Latin" in large numbers—however reasonable the circumstances might make such a course—it would confirm their worst suspicions and put the prospect of reunion yet further off.

Reference to "foreign elements" in America leads by association of ideas to what is called "the Negro problem"—though a radical point about the Negroes, at any rate as seen north of the Mason and Dixon line, is that they are simply Americans—and "old Americans" at that—but with a dark skin and certain modified racial characteristics—just as English, Irish, French and other American stocks have modified characteristics. There have been sporadic artificially aroused outbursts of Pan-African enthusiasm here and there, but Africa means no more to the average American Negro than the mouth of the Elbe, ancient Denmark and the Brythons mean to an average Englishman: except for "colour", Haarlem and its life hardly differ from any other urban proletarian section. An outline sketch of the position can be found in *Le Problème Noir aux Etats-Unis*, by Father P. J. Creusen, S.J. (Xaveriana series, Louvain), and a more detailed account in Miss I. C. Brown's *Story of the American Negro*.

*To say nothing of the effect of "inter-ritual" marriages.

Statistics are apt to be tiresome, but here they come in useful. I compare those of the American Negro "missions" with those of one missionary society alone in Africa, namely, the White Fathers.

	U.S.A.	White Fathers
Total coloured population .. c.	13,000,000	c. 20,000,000
Protestants c.	5,000,000	c. 750,000 ?
Not professing Christianity .. c.	7,750,000	c. 18,000,000
Baptized Catholics*	256,000	1,244,000
White Missionary Priests	c. 300	784
Coloured priests	A dozen, or less	134
White nuns	c. 800	620
Coloured nuns	c. 400	433

There is more significance in these figures than appears on the surface, especially in the lack of American Negro priests; and when, further, we consider the hundreds of thousands of dollars contributed yearly by the Catholics of U.S.A. to foreign missions, a certain lack of proportion becomes clearly evident. The bishops' active concern for the coloured race goes back to the second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 at least, and much has been done of late years, especially by the priests of the Society of St. Joseph† and of the Society of the Divine Word, by the Benedictines of the American Cassinese congregation in their industrial and agricultural institute at Rock Castle, Va., and by the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament who conduct the Xavier University for Negroes at New Orleans: but the generality of Catholics still lag far behind in interest in this most important mission in their very midst.

The conclusion can hardly be avoided that this indifference is largely due to the fact that many American Catholics share the common attitude of their white fellow countrymen towards their coloured fellow

* Nearly one quarter of the Catholic American Negroes live in the diocese of Lafayette, in the south-western part of Louisiana (*The Register*, Denver, 26 December, 1937). It was said twenty-five years ago that in that state 30,000 Negroes had lost the faith for lack of priests.

† This society had its origin in four of Cardinal Vaughan's Mill Hill missionaries, who came to Baltimore in 1871 to take care of St. Francis Xavier's church for Negroes there.

countrymen. To the English Catholic who has not been corrupted by the lesser-breeds-without-the-law idea, to the European in general, it comes as a shock to find that there is a number of Catholics who accept and perpetuate the discrimination, conscious and unconscious, open and hidden, legal and illegal, that in varying degrees is exercised against Negro* coloured people throughout the United States. Many Catholic employers will employ Negro workers only in those low capacities commonly regarded as "nigger jobs"; many Catholic schools, colleges, and universities discourage or exclude coloured pupils; it is not unknown for Catholic Negroes to be turned away from a church door or to be segregated in the back benches;† the face-saving sentiment so often heard in the northern states, especially from would-be "broadminded" women, "I believe that God created the Negroes to be perfect servants", is heard on the lips of Catholics—here is, indeed, as the Belgian Father Creusen says, "*un fait inexplicable pour le catholique étranger et un problème bien digne de son attention.*"

Only a few months ago in a big city of the eastern states a Catholic Negro boy was refused a place in his Catholic parochial school, admittedly because of the colour of his skin. The present writer was privileged to attend a meeting which considered the occurrence: there were present two whites (a lawyer and a university professor) and four coloured people, viz., a young law-student, a middle-aged physician, an older man probably of some more humble occupation, and the father of the boy concerned. It will not be easy to forget the clear-mindedness, reasonableness, charity, and gentle good temper of those oppressed citizens of a great republic, the quiet determination of three of them, and the anxiety, both touching and painful, of the young father that nothing should be done that would cause unpleasantness for anybody.‡ As the result of the

* Not, in general, against others. Indeed, it is a common boast (generally false) of "old Americans" that they have (Red) Indian blood in their veins.

† There are, of course, Negro parishes, as there are Italian, Polish, etc. parishes, but Italians are not excluded from non-Italian churches!

‡ For the sake of peace he was prepared to send his boy to the secular school, as, it appeared, many other coloured Catholics had had to do.

measures decided on that evening the school's ban was lifted, and thus one more step was taken in the clearing-up of a grave blot on the Catholics of the United States.

That clearing-up has been long overdue, but it is now being pursued with considerable vigour and effectiveness, especially by young people. At the congress at Boston in October 1937, of the National Catholic Alumni Federation, representing 300,000 college graduates, it was resolved that each of its sixteen chapters should form a committee to forward the work of the Church for American Negroes and to improve relations between the races: the motion was vigorously opposed by a small minority of diehards, but the final votes of the 213 delegates found the minority reduced to two. At a meeting at Fordham University, New York, in August last year, arranged by the Catholic Interracial Council and attended by school teachers, administrators, and students from all over the country, it was unanimously resolved to call on all Catholic colleges to admit duly qualified Negroes as fully accredited students, "as far as existing laws will permit".*

Much of the credit for this stirring of conscience is due to the work of the above-mentioned Catholic Interracial Council, which was founded by Father William Markoe, S.J., of Saint Louis, and Schuyler N. Warren. Its president is Dr. Hudson J. Oliver, a prominent Negro physician, and among its active white directors are Dr. Harry McNeill, professor at Fordham, and Francis S. Moseley, of John Adams High School, New York. It publishes an interesting monthly, *The Interracial Review* (220 West 42nd Street, New York. \$1 a year), among the regular contributors to which is Father John LaFarge, S.J., who stands out among the clergy by his work for interracial justice. He has recently published a book under that title which has been warmly commended by the Cardinal-Archbishops of Boston and Philadelphia. Father LaFarge is well seconded by two Dominicans, Fathers Edward Hughes and J. C. Kearns, who are interested in the canonization of the mulatto

* This presumably refers to local civil laws operative in certain states in the south.

Blessed Martin de Porres, O.P., as an encouragement to the rehabilitation of the Negro race.

As an example of the Negro reaction to these Catholic activities, I quote the following from their *Philadelphia Tribune* of 18 November, 1937, *à propos* the Inter-collegiate Interracial Conference held in that city :

Because *The Tribune* believes that the sponsors of the conference are sincere in their effort to achieve "social justice" for all Americans, it desires to point out certain basic weaknesses in interracial movements of this kind, with the hope that the Catholic interracial conference may avoid them and therefore achieve its goal. . . . It is important to the success of the conference that it be made known that the Catholic Church has not been fair towards coloured people, and that coloured people are far from perfect. . . . The Catholic Church has started to apply the high principles of the church to the race problem. It is a noble experiment which will work if facts are not dodged.

It is common for Americans to express admiration for the English Catholic press at the expense of their own, but in some respects their envy seems unnecessary (and in any case we English writers are notoriously ready to write for the American press—and with reason !). If we have *THE DUBLIN REVIEW*, they have *Thought*; if we have the *Month*, they have the *Catholic World*—each distinguished for the excellence of its editorial comments; if we have the *Tablet*, they have the *Commonweal*: that leaves *Blackfriars* to our credit, and *Orate Fratres* to theirs. We have no widely read popular periodicals similar to the *Sign* or the *Extension Magazine*—on the other hand, they have nothing like our three national twopenny weekly newspapers. This is the surprising thing about the American Catholic press: with twenty million faithful we should expect them even to have a big daily—but they have not. Of course in a country so large that there can be no secular newspaper of national distribution, a national Catholic one would be no less difficult (though the *Christian Science Monitor* seems to manage it); but a weekly (or daily) paper general to each of the four great divisions of the country (east, middle-west, west, south) ought to be

possible. Instead there are numerous diocesan papers, of very varying quality, but alike deficient in effectiveness and efficiency because of this "atomization" and necessary preoccupation with matters of only local significance.* One of them, in the archdiocese of Dubuque, is actually a daily—I was always hearing about this *rara avis* but never managed to see a copy;† another, the *Register*, of Denver, is spreading to other dioceses, somewhat after the manner of the local editions of the English *Catholic Herald* in the days of Charles Diamond: opinion is divided as to whether this is the beginning of a quasi-national weekly or whether its expansion is more or less over. The *Wanderer*, an unofficial weekly "modern political and economic review", published in English and German editions at St. Paul, is in a class by itself: at present its circulation is limited; were it to go throughout the United States it would be to the advantage of the Church's gospel.

But the most significant periodical of all is the *Catholic Worker*, in newspaper format but published monthly, written by workers for workers in the language that they speak and understand. It is more than a periodical, it represents a "movement", for the practical here-and-now application of Christian principles by Catholics, beginning with individuals, to social and economic problems: accordingly in such matters as property rights, labour disputes, industrial victimization, war, or racial discrimination it is "radical" (a word that is used in America today in the hostile sense it had in England fifty years and more ago) and proceeds by "direct action".‡ Equally accordingly the *Catholic Worker* has been

* American Catholics have no difficulty in admitting that some of these diocesan papers are most unsatisfactory; that their general news consists of verbatim printing of the N.C.W.C.'s bulletins, that their advertisement columns suggest that their readers are all in an advanced state of physical decay and mental atrophy, that their whole set-up is deplorable.

† Curiously enough, there are several dailies published by Catholic national groups in their own languages. I have no recent figures, but at one time there were seven in French, four in Polish, two in German and one in Czech.

‡ There was an excellent article on the "Worker" movement, by the Rev. H. A. Reinhold, in *Schweizerische Rundschau* (Benziger, Einsiedeln), December 1937. The circulation of the paper is now 110,000 a month. The Worker "cell" in New York feeds 800 men daily, Pittsburgh 500, Detroit 160, Milwaukee 50, and so on. This costs money.

zealously attacked by many Catholics, but without success, for its orthodoxy cannot be impugned and it has considerable support among the clergy; and those most strongly opposed to its methods (and even some of its aims) are moved to admiration of the disinterested selflessness of those who direct it and its work for the suffering and oppressed. While it will have no truck with Communism in Spain (or anywhere else) the "Worker" has been the chief among a few American Catholic periodicals in maintaining the view that it would have been politically more wise and spiritually more effective had the Spanish Catholics resisted evil by methods other than those of armed force, especially in view of the advice given by both the Holy See and the bishops of U.S.A. to the persecuted Catholics of Mexico some years ago.

From its headquarters in the Bowery section of New York the "Worker" movement has spread to Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Philadelphia, and a score of other cities, but it is characteristic of it that it is deliberately loosely knit and not centrally organized (it is not fond of card-indexes or other elaborate systematizations).* The Catholic Radical Alliance of Fathers Rice and Hensler in Pittsburgh is another part of this generalized movement, and the "Worker" seems to be more and more setting the pace for Catholic social work in America. This means that there one meets very often a sense of individual responsibility, a willingness to face facts and objectively to consider unpalatable suggestions, a practicality, an open-mindedness and a liveliness that are extremely encouraging: people are not so oppressed by the dregs of European tradition. There has been a great deal of Red-baiting, but it is being more and more widely realized that Communism can be got rid of only by getting rid of its causes, by less talk about the rights of property and more concern for the rights of the propertyless. Said Cardinal Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, recently:

* To a flippancy mind like mine the supreme example of organization defeating its own ends is the cheer-leader and his gang at that contest of trained gladiators called a football game. Do their efforts make the slightest difference to the contestants?

"The trouble with us in the past has been that we were too often allied, or drawn into an alliance, with the wrong side. Selfish employers of labour have flattered the Church by calling it "the great conservative force", and then called upon it to act as a police-force while they paid a pittance to those who worked for them. Our place is beside the poor, behind the working man."

It is characteristic of the new spirit that American priests have appeared on strike-picket lines as a gesture of sympathy and support, and as a practical help.*

The open-mindedness and vigorous realism just referred to is well in evidence in the United States. The present writer met it repeatedly among the professors and students in ecclesiastical seminaries and lay colleges, in monasteries, among clergy and laity generally—a small minority, no doubt, but a potentially powerful one. It is shown not only in the political and socio-economic spheres, e.g., the realization that the present industrial-capitalist system, and all that goes with it, is half-way to Communism, or that many Catholic baiters of "liberalism" and "democracy" are throwing out the baby with the bath-water; but in such a matter (fundamental in America) as a recognition that statistics of holy communions are not necessarily a guide to the state of a people's religion, or that a sufficient Christian education is not necessarily to be had in a school because it is Catholic. It is evidenced by the question repeatedly put to me by clergy and seminarists, "What in England are considered the chances for a more vernacular liturgy?" It is evidenced by the priest who, having visited many Anglican churches in this country, said, "I was most impressed by their congregational, liturgical worship, that *pietas anglicana*. I am told it is dying. It will be tragic if a place cannot be found for it in the Universal Church, where it would have a new and authentic life, with any deficiencies supplied."

We can learn from America.

DONALD ATTWATER.

* The Worker movement has also given birth to the Association of Catholic Trades Unionists (ACTU) and to a "Pax" peace society on the English model.

THE CITY OF GOD AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF MAN*

WILLIAM PITT is said to have observed of Butler's *Analogy* that it opened as many questions and raised as many doubts as it solved; and there is, perhaps, no less compliment than criticism to be found in the fact that a remark, originally made in connection with so outstanding a piece of apologetic, should come back to mind as a first reflection upon the three volumes, now completed, of Mr. Lionel Curtis's *Civitas Dei*. The true significance, indeed, of Pitt's observation lies, as Dean Church wisely indicates, in the impossibility of sounding those depths upon the surface of which our frail thoughts float, without finding the problems that they disclose utterly beyond our understanding or mastery. We have scarcely perceived a law or recognized a law-giver before strong currents carry us on into those mysterious vortices of chance and change which lead men to say that the unexpected is what happens and that no occurrence can any more surprise them.

Mr. Curtis does not, it is true, show himself so conscious as Bishop Butler of moving in deep waters. Essentially practical and exceptionally endowed with the power of getting things done, he may readily be excused for ignoring or glossing over difficulties that would engage minds of a subtler texture than his own. The very title that he has adopted for his book—the tremendous title, so closely reminiscent of St. Augustine's famous treatise—of *Civitas Dei* discovers the bold adventurer susceptible to the charm of a great name and a grand idea, but less sensitive than a scholar would ordinarily be to all that the name and the idea demand of him. Concerned to reach the islands of the blest, he sees himself as the fellow-traveller of all such as in every age have sought a better country; and as such his work is worthy to be praised, and will be praised, by all whose faces are set in the same direction. Yet no emphasis is needed to enforce the incalculable difference between the route of a vessel

* *Civitas Dei*, by Lionel Curtis. In 3 vols. Macmillan.

which puts to sea off the coast of Greece and lands its passengers on the shores of Australia and that sublime odyssey which may well be thought of as starting from the port of Ostia on the day when Augustine, with Monica beside him, looked out thence towards the distant ramparts of the world and, traversing in thought the intervening, troubled sea of time, set foot, if only for a moment, in the City of God. If the winds and waves of the twentieth century appear no less formidable than those of the fifth, it is evident that Mr. Curtis relies a good deal less than St. Augustine, or than sailors in general, upon supernatural aid. The new *Civitas Dei* moves forward with so happy a confidence as to make even the sea-change from green to blue, which has come over the colour of his volumes in the course of publication, seem nicely calculated to suggest the movement of a mind passing from under the influence of troubled waters into that of summer skies. Hope, in a word, which is properly a theological virtue, figures here, as in so much current thought, as a political one, though whether to the advancement of political wisdom it might be a pity to inquire.

Amidst all this "plain sailing" of the experienced publicist there may, however, be detected a perception that there are things both in heaven and earth which do not altogether fit in with his philosophy. He notices himself the strangeness of the fact—all the stranger because the mention of it follows closely upon a profession of political preference for the Protestant standpoint—that he is obliged to borrow the words of a Catholic poet for his valediction, with the pleasing result, let it be gratefully added, that his readers are left with Francis Thompson's lovely fragment upon "The Kingdom of God" echoing in their memories. Not all of them, assuredly, will be insensible to a certain incongruity in this juxtaposition of "Jacob's ladder pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross" on the one hand and, on the other, of the "first footbridge across the gulf in men's minds which now prevents the world from passing from the national to the international commonwealth", or, in simpler language, of the Dominions of Australia and New Zealand. For, even though political constitutions in the

Antipodes may deserve all the praise that Mr. Curtis has to give them as agents of the commonwealth principle, it is still bound to be a little disconcerting when they are held up as forerunners of the Kingdom of God—in St. Augustine's sense, that is, or in Francis Thompson's. Not quite so easily does British imperialism coalesce with Catholic thought; nor is a civilization, once balanced on the ideas of a natural and a supernatural world, quite so simply poised anew upon the shoulders of our British Colossus with feet extended from Pole to Pole.

It is significant that the ship in which we have imagined Mr. Curtis to be sailing from Greece to Australia pauses in passing at Palestine—significant because by implication it seems to repudiate the once popular Liberal idea that politics could be successfully separated from religion. Not many political writers have nowadays anything so considerable or, for the matter of that, so baffling to say as he has on the subject of Christianity. Whilst rejecting legislation based upon divine authority as incompatible with "progress", he bears witness to the "amazing capacity which Jesus had of seeing things as they really are"; and, whilst denouncing as a dangerous fallacy the "claim of Churches and schools to be answerable in the first degree for forming the character of a people", he commits himself to the extent of declaring that "a commonwealth is simply the Sermon on the Mount translated into political terms". This is much as if one should argue that an intelligent ruler should abstain from all effective steps to implement his laws or inculcate his precepts. But the obscurity deepens when the Sermon on the Mount is deprived of the support of the Resurrection. Mr. Curtis assures us—contrary to the opinion which St. Paul is so precisely concerned to impress on the Corinthians—that the "belief . . . that souls are immortal cannot be proved by evidence that a man has risen from the dead". For this, he considers, would "prove only that the human spirit can continue in time for some period after the body is dead." But, if this be so, there appears to be so much the more need for the body of Our Lord to have

been resuscitated. Mr. Curtis, however, on the strength of a little book, now some thirty years old, on *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, by Professor Kirsopp Lake, rejects this possibility. Spirit-appearances, not bodily manifestations, are the most that the Professor will allow, the body of the Redeemer, consequently, remaining in the grave, and the women, conjecturally, visiting the wrong one. It is no great wonder that, with such a guide to improbability, Mr. Curtis brushes the supernatural element altogether aside. For, in the Professor's book, what was a cosmic event has sunk to the level of a psychic phenomenon. There had been, that is to say, no glorification such as the Transfiguration had prefigured, of the human frame, no relief of a creation groaning and travailing in pain and awaiting the redemption of the body, no foretaste of a restoration of all things in Christ, no manifestation in power of the Kingdom of God. We are left with a corpse and an apparition.

This is no place to attempt to show the strength of the evidence for Christ's physical resurrection, thus so cavalierly dismissed. It must suffice to reply to Mr. Curtis that Edersheim, a Protestant critic of—to say the least—as great weight as Professor Lake, commits himself, once and again, in his immensely learned *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, to the statement that the Resurrection is the "best-established fact in history" and that a publicist who doubts or denies it is in as grave danger of suppressing truth with incalculable consequences for mankind as his opponents can conceivably be of fostering error. Christendom was founded by St. Peter and St. Paul on the certainty that Christ had risen, in deed and in truth, from the tomb; and it does really need something more substantial than Professor Lake's youthful speculations to dislocate the unseen foundations of European society. In dealing with the perpetual challenge to the Christian faith there is, as Dean Church long ago warned us, a grave danger of mistaking a position assailed for a position lost; and it is sometimes salutary to steady one's judgement as to the value and method of the Higher Criticism by submitting mere secular matter to

its insidious embraces. Let the effect of it be tried, for instance, upon Mr. Curtis's allusion to the first Lord Acton—a man with whose work he plainly claims no little acquaintance, since he goes so far as to recognize him as one of the rare men really qualified by their learning to construct a philosophy of history and to say that "more knowledge of history perished with him than any one mind has ever acquired". With such general observations he includes this specific statement: "So deeply absorbed was Acton's life in the task of collecting knowledge that he left behind him a volume of essays and the plan of a history for others to write."

Now, suppose that our Western civilization were to perish in some vast catastrophe and that a few scattered fragments only were left of all our libraries. And suppose that amongst these fragments the only surviving references to Acton were contained in Mr. Curtis's statement just quoted and in a statement of my own that Acton wrote four large octavo volumes and that his total output might at a rough guess have fallen not far short in bulk of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. A higher critic, in face of so wide a discrepancy between Mr. Curtis's "one" volume and my "four", might conceivably dismiss Acton as a merely mythical figure to whom the twentieth century had transferred the attributes of the Muse of History. But, if he stopped short of such drastic scepticism as this, must he not at least on his principles assume that the discrepancy illustrates the fatal tendency of the human mind to exaggerate? Mr. Curtis, the critic would argue, was not only, on his own showing, familiar with Acton's work, but a Fellow of All Souls' College who time and again must have heard Acton's achievements discussed by the distinguished body of historians belonging to that institution. He could not possibly, then, have written as if Acton had produced only one volume, had there in fact been four. Of myself, on the other hand, the critic should feel there was every cause to be distrustful. "Roman Catholics", he should argue, "were never in England reputed accurate; and, besides this, a Roman Catholic would naturally tend to magnify the accomplishment of his co-religionist. The 'four' volumes may,

therefore, confidently be dismissed as the fond fancy of a romancer."

Such critical considerations will be found sobering if at their conclusion reference be made to a list of Acton's published works and Mr. Curtis's statement tested by observation. More in regard to caution it might seem impertinent to urge, unless it were to notice, as a fact of some psychological interest, how little, even in the hey-day of the Higher Criticism, the higher critics have ever appeared able to impress the most eminent lawyers. Cairns and Selborne in the last century were lord chancellors of outstanding distinction, but their ardent belief in Christianity appears to have been quite unaffected by the work of Strauss or Renan or Baur. They knew, what every lawyer knows, how easy it is to produce a plausible case for all manner of vagaries; and their quiet confidence in tradition has been vindicated by a recession of some eighty or more years in Harnack's dating of the Synoptic Gospels as compared with the dating of Strauss (A.D. 65-70 as compared with A.D. 150). So vast a change as this on so vital an issue may well justify the view that the Higher Criticism is not worth much unless and until it has itself been highly criticized by common sense. Even the Higher Criticism of Genesis, whose opening chapter Mr. Curtis assures us (Vol. I, p. 35) to be "beyond all question the work of a Hebrew exile in Babylon", has been placed under fresh suspicion by the work of Dr. Yahuda,* which shows the Egyptian origin of precisely that passage. Can we be sure that in time the traditional authorship of the Books of Moses may not be as satisfactorily vindicated as that of the Synoptic Gospels? Professional critics work, we have always to remember, under a terrible, often probably unconscious, temptation to find something novel to say; and there is all too much in Mr. Curtis's volumes to lead plain men and women to suppose that those *vera lumina mundi* which first lit the Easter beacons with pentecostal fire have been really put out by the eddying winds of opinion.

Enough, however, has, at least for the present, been

* Yahuda. *The Accuracy of the Bible*, p. 143.

said of this aspect of Mr. Curtis's book. It remains to consider what the shrunken Protestantism with which he furnishes the mind of his international commonwealth really amounts to. It seems that, after all deductions, we are left with conscience, with a God more closely resembling the God of the Deist than of the Theist, since, having set the world in motion, he has left it to take care of itself, and, finally, with a prospect of human survival such as is afforded by the *Phaedo* of Plato or the Society for Psychical Research. The question is whether these conclusions afford sufficient support to the Christian ethic that Mr. Curtis approves, or whether his confession of faith would not be correctly classified with the more famous confession of faith of the "Vicaire Savoyard" and as correctly dismissed in the same terms as John Morley applies to that memorable excursus into theology as "a rag of metaphysic floating in the sunshine of sentimentalism". It is certainly no easy matter to see how Mr. Curtis is going to triumph when he speaks with his enemies in the gate of his new City of God. Unattested by miracle, unsupported by a living Church, indifferently authenticated by a Bible imperfectly believed, the Christian evangel appears precisely to have lost that authoritative quality which Mr. Curtis indeed deprecates on principle, but without which its claim to acceptance can hardly on rigid analysis appear more than an appeal to personal preferences. If we have only to do with human opinion, the man who elects to make physics the basis of his political creed has to all appearance as good a title to be heard as the man who chooses to draw his convictions from metaphysics. In a world to which the Deity has given neither law nor sign there seems no more reason to stage an international commonwealth against a soft background of Galilean hills than against the hard steppes of Russia. The Humanities, indeed, like the Greeks in St. John's Gospel, where Humanism and Christianity have met and kissed, seem to plead that they "would see Jesus"; and, in the light of the Incarnation and the Resurrection, it is possible so to flood Greek ideals with supernatural light as to invest *la cité antique*

with something of the mystical beauty of the City of God. But, since, as we have seen, Mr. Curtis's excursion into Palestine yields more in the nature of shattered illusion than tangible result, it is not obvious that he would be able to hold his own in a *terre-à-terre* argument either with the school of Lenin which declares that there is no God or the school of Hitler which envisages God as a tribal deity of German rather than Jewish descent. If the pale Galilean did not conquer, if Death was never vanquished by Love, if in fact there is no substantial proof of any Power making for righteousness or of any life beyond the grave, then, under the influence of Darwinian ideas, strife and force should resume their sway and the last word in politics be no better nor wiser than that justice is the interest of the stronger. It is necessary to insist upon this. Already, whilst Mr. Curtis sails away to the Antipodes in search of some political philosopher's-stone, in the old world—in that *Europe tragique* which has been the subject of a recent remarkable volume by a Continental publicist, M. Gonzague de Reynold—the sign of Caesar, if it be not actually the mark of the Beast, has appeared, not in the sky, where few eyes are nowadays fixed, but in the high places of the earth and upon the seats of the mighty.

It is a significant and sinister circumstance, of which Mr. Curtis takes little or no account, that the term "commonwealth", which has so much charm for his ear, is in fact as easily associated with a type of government wholly opposed to his own humane, pacific, and popular ideals and has long been thus unpleasantly defined by its English historical usage. The Commonwealth *par excellence* was both a product of unadulterated Protestantism and at the same time a military despotism so long remembered and so greatly feared that, as Lecky puts it, "the shadow of Cromwell fell darkly across the path of Marlborough". Oliver himself, its first begetter, was, if the truth be told, no better than a Philistine whom Arnold, a very competent judge, classes together with Luther and Bunyan as one of the leading fellow-countrymen of Goliath. Such, however, are the eccentricities of hero-worship that, not only

Carlyle but Gardiner has reckoned him a representative Englishman and that his statue has been set up outside the Hall where he murdered Charles I by judicial process and close to the site where he insulted parliamentary institutions as they have never been insulted either before or since. So easy is it for despotic forms to seem consistent with democratic ideas, for efficiency to silence the voices of freedom, and for the dubious hero of an evil hour to be acclaimed as the lasting embodiment of the general will !

These reflections, let it be added, are at the present time very much to the point. For Cromwell's conception of commonwealth now dominates the mind of one half Europe ; and Britons would appear to be stopped by their recent fulsome praise of him from maintaining that a representative assembly rather than a representative man is the true expression of the commonwealth idea. At best there is an obvious arrogance in suggesting that popular government can be popular only on British lines ; nor, even if this were so, would it be conclusive. The *populus* is not the *plebs* ; and the closer we bring our institutions to universal suffrage the more carefully do we need to consider whether in fact plebiscites such as dictators take do not furnish a truer reflection of the mind of the many than all the elaborate machinery of parliamentary institutions. Ideologies may be anathematized but cannot be ignored ; and it may well be doubted whether we shall come to the conception of a commonwealth of many nations until we have cleared our thought as to what constitutes the commonweal of one.

There is, however, another and a deeper difficulty lying in Mr. Curtis's path. We have to deal not only with nations but with cultures ; and men are little likely to be able to live at peace with one another until their minds are at rest as to the ultimate values that govern their lives. In Professor Toynbee's *Study of History* we find twenty or more distinct cultures enumerated and much stress laid on what he calls the interaction of the principles of "yin" and "yang"—upon that perpetual challenge of activity to repose which is responsible in his view for the progressive differentiation of civilization

from custom. The theory discloses a state of things strangely at variance with Mr. Curtis's notion of a world quietly consolidating itself into a federation under the beneficent influence of British good sense and by the progressive surrender of their sovereign rights on the part of independent communities. Few, however, will be prepared to deny its plausibility, and fewer still perhaps be found to affirm their faith in Mr. Curtis's counter-suggestion.

We can all see that the advances of science, and the consequent growing interdependence of nations, impose upon us a cosmopolitanism not dreamed of formerly, if civilization is to survive. But the belief that a people noted for insularity can in this respect give a lead and a new order to the world is a confession of robust patriotism rather than a policy of profound understanding. It is but the other day that the great Anglo-Saxon edifice of a League of Nations, reared on a foundation of enlightened self-interest, crashed in dire confusion; and it is hardly to be supposed that a scheme involving as a preliminary anything so considerable as a sacrifice of sovereign rights would fare better. Something, perhaps, might be hoped of a society of nations formed after the model of a gentleman's club with all its members pledged, on pain of summary expulsion, to have peace one with another yet in no way bound by obligations of mutual defence. But far more than this is required for the introduction of a new world-order; nothing less, in fact, than a sentiment outclassing patriotism and focusing imagination upon the thought of the Kingdom of God. In the very nature of things the Protestant Churches of the British Empire can never supply this. They are avowedly national—the disestablished Churches of Ireland and Wales no less than the established Churches of England and Scotland—and their limitations are writ plain upon their faces. For a national Church is in conception the reverse of a universal Church; and all the word-play in the world will never make it otherwise. In its faith, its formularies, its origin, it is the product of some national idiosyncrasy; and the notion, sometimes put forward, that it repro-

duces the lost simplicity of the primitive Church of the Apostles will not stand a moment's serious investigation. No Church, no century, no people can ever reproduce the characteristic features of an earlier time. In all history, ecclesiastical or profane, we are faced by the inexorable fact of evolution; and, if we are really seeking an organic development as opposed to revolutionary action, we must look closely for the marks of that broadening down from precedent to precedent of which we so often boast in respect of English secular institutions.

It is this test or measure that in his sketch of ecclesiastical history Mr. Curtis so noticeably fails to apply. His treatment of the Middle Age would raise in an uneducated reader no suspicion that he was studying an incomparable effort to realize in and through the idea of Christendom that very commonwealth of nations which he has so deeply at heart. His discussion of the death of Hus is in this respect particularly instructive. A native humanity in his outlook, which in itself cannot be too greatly praised, is so deeply outraged that he does not hesitate to compare Hus's trial with the trial of Christ. The Council of Constance is similarly likened to the Sanhedrin, and the treachery of Sigismund consequently dyed to a darker hue than even the vacillation of Pilate. Compare, however, the way in which the great Anglican historian of the Papacy deals with the same subject :

Sigismund's perfidy [says Creighton] must not be laid down to ecclesiastical obliquity of vision caused by fanaticism or religious hate; it was but the logical result of the idea of Europe as a Christian commonwealth which might admit of national differences in things temporal, but in things spiritual was subject to the same laws and the same government.*

All the inconvenient postulates of the commonwealth idea become apparent in that passage. Just as the individual State will not tolerate in times of crisis the default or treachery of its nationals, so neither can a super-State consent to condone the revolt of its inter-

* Creighton. *History of the Papacy*. Bk. II, ch. 5.

nationals. It was not the Church, as Creighton sees, which put Hus to death, but precisely the international commonwealth. For Wycliffe and Hus, however little they may have understood the effect of their action, were striking at that notion of a united Christendom which with infinite labour had been brought into being as the old secular super-State of Rome declined. The magnitude of the political peril in which Europe stood could not, indeed, be measured at the date of the Council of Constance; but we who contemplate the irreparable disruption that resulted a century later from an extension of ideas—hostile, indeed, to the authority of Rome, but still more hostile to the dignity of human freedom—can be in no doubt of its existence. The political disintegration that resulted from Luther's excursions into theology must appal every statesmanlike intellect; and we need feel no surprise in seeing the greatest humanists of his day, and notably such wise reformers as St. Thomas More and Erasmus, using their best endeavours to defeat this German lawlessness.

If these things, then, are considered, it will seem to be no slight irony that Mr. Curtis, the champion at once of humanism and of the international idea, should seek his associates in the Protestant camp. Historically and philosophically—if there be any proprietorship in ideas at all—the conception of a *Civitas Dei* is the property of the Catholic Church of the Middle Age. It forms part of the great testament of St. Augustine; it takes shape in the policy of Charlemagne; it comes to maturity in the pontificates of Gregory VII and Innocent III; and it is implicitly recognized at Constance as an element so essential to international comity that neither the Babylonish captivity at Avignon nor the scandal of the Great Schism in the Papacy seriously weakened belief in it. The existence of this great federation under the respective spiritual and secular leadership of pope and emperor had, indeed, neither eradicated war nor driven hatred and greed and passion underground; yet, even so, in the idea and institutions of Christendom we may perceive, not such a mere piece of machinery as we have seen collapse within a few years of its inception

at Geneva, but a sentiment capable of holding the imagination of Western Europe for a thousand years and not incapable of utilizing those forces of corporate and personal religion without which men will always labour in vain to convert the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of Christ. Statesmen, who were in the Middle Age so often and so unavoidably churchmen, sometimes forgot, as the Sons of Thunder also forgot, what spirit they were of, and in the endeavour to promote or to preserve the commonwealth of God resorted to methods of forcible repression which shock us still. Yet, on a dispassionate view, it seems possible enough that the vicarious vengeance of which our own times have seen so much—not to speak of the direct persecution, imprisonment, torture, and exile of political antagonists over a great part of Europe—will evoke no less criticism, if the world ever enters again upon a gentler age. It is a strange commentary upon our much-vaunted progress in humanity and readiness for a reign of universal law to find Mr. Curtis pillorying a Government which contained some of the most humane Englishmen of our period—Lord Balfour and Mr. Fisher, to speak of no others—for its use in Ireland of the “method of meeting crime with crime”, and a commentary that gives almost as much food for reflection as the abortive intention of the League of Nations to recommend peace by blockade or war with their inevitable repercussions upon the lives of a great number of helpless and innocent persons.

These strange anomalies, these violent contradictions bear, however, their own peculiar witness to man’s unfailing need of a common code of thought and consequently, beyond this, to the profound wisdom of Him who in His representative capacity as the Son of Man prayed that His followers at least might all be one—possessed, that is, according to St. Paul’s amplification of the thought, of one faith and united in one body, no less than in one spirit. The modern world has tried often enough to work without this idea; and great has been the ingenuity of latitudinarian divines and the fertility of political publicists in emasculating it of meaning. Yet always it reasserts itself, as lately at

Geneva when the unholy and unintelligent desire to enrol Soviet Russia at all costs as a proselyte was followed by a nemesis so swift as to prove a moral for all whose minds were not shut against experience. "Behind every civilization," observes Mr. Christopher Dawson very justly, "there is a vision." And behind any *Civitas Dei* there is the vision of God. Those, then, who know not God are not qualified for this citizenship.

Upon the clarity and fullness of that heavenly vision everything in fact depends. "Our whole business . . . in this life", says the author of the earlier treatise on the commonwealth of God (St. Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei*), "is to restore to health the eye of the heart whereby God may be seen."* And when politicians and diplomats tell us that we need, if the world is to be pulled together, a change of heart, they mean, if they mean anything serious at all, precisely this. Only with a single eye intent upon the justice of God can nations hope to pick their way along the tangled, precipitous path which lies between the egotism to which an inordinate love for one's own country inevitably prompts and that insidious type of altruism which causes a people to refuse its duty or forgo its destiny.

By no mundane considerations, then, but by this other must the worth of Mr. Curtis's book ultimately be decided. Will the deity there invoked find worshippers sufficient to drive out the racial and national idolatries that contest his sovereignty? Can he persuade men to rise up, leave their old habitations, and go forth, not knowing whither they are bound, in search of a better country? Can he extinguish their mutual hatreds, rouse their latent affections, and cause them to be born again—this cold, anaemic god who looked on so long in silence whilst Christ died and was buried, never, so far at least as the citizens of this new *Civitas Dei* are aware, to rise again! It seems improbable; and probability—to return to Bishop Butler, with whom we started—is the guide of life.

There is, as we have already seen, another possibility—to say no more—which deserves fuller consideration

* *Serm. (de Script. N.T.), LXXXVIII, v, 5.*

than Mr. Curtis gives it. It seems *prima facie* probable enough that the catholic idea in politics may consort best with a Catholic interpretation of history. Assume, then, if only for the sake of argument, that Our Lord was a statesman as well as the poet and the moralist whom a patronizing criticism perceives; assume that St. Matthew's Gospel—the gospel addressed more especially to the Jews—may be expected to show the Jewish developing into the Christian Church; assume that the promise to St. Peter, which is found there, was no ill-judged *obiter dictum* but the announcement of a profound and far-reaching policy, and consequently that the gradual growth of the Papacy was as much in the nature of a true evolution as the development of the British Parliament from its first beginnings in the Witanagemot of the Saxon kings—assume such things and the student will find that some otherwise intractable pages of history, conceived as a providential design, will fall without difficulty into place. He will be able, for instance, to assimilate Dean Milman's profound remark with reference to the Middle Age that “upon the rise of a Power both controlling and conservative [viz. the Papacy] hung, humanly speaking, the life and death of Christianity”, and—even more pertinent from the standpoint of the commonwealth idea—also its sequel which runs thus :

It is impossible for man to imagine by what other organizing or consolidating force [viz. than the mediaeval Papacy] the commonwealth of the Western nations could have grown up into a discordant, indeed, and conflicting league, but still a league with that unity and conformity of manners, usages, laws, and religion which have made their rivalries, oppugnancies, and even their long, ceaseless wars, on the whole to issue in the noblest, highest, most intellectual form of civilization known to men.

The prejudice from which the historian of Latin Christianity long ago freed himself, the prejudice which disappears wholly in the late Master of Balliol's statement with reference to the Middle Age that “the Papacy, taking it all in all, was the greatest potentiality

for good that existed at the time or perhaps that has ever existed", lurks still in Mr. Curtis's mind, appearing now in his treatment of the case of Galileo and again in his manner of dealing with the famous bull of Alexander VI relating to the New World. It is time that matters of this kind should cease to confuse counsel. It is time that we remembered that Copernicus's great work was dedicated to Pope Paul III and forgot that Galileo's still immature argument once drew upon it the misplaced attentions of the Roman Congregations. The relation between the earth and the sun no longer admits of absolute definition in the light of the theory of relativity. For the human race in general, and the poet in particular, the sun still rises; for the astronomer the earth circles around the sun; whilst for the metaphysically minded man of science each of these heavenly bodies revolves about the other. A little more tact on Galileo's part and a little less zeal on that of the Roman congregations concerned and the question might have been left over until knowledge made it ripe for treatment. But there seems no reason why a hasty judgement in science should poison for evermore the wells of politics; and so much the less that a better understanding of the circumstances is likely to modify the force of much familiar criticism. Still more to the point is such caution in respect of the Papal bulls relating to the discovery of new countries. Of the most abused of them—for there were three—the *Cambridge Modern History* remarks:

Often singled out as a prominent illustration of Romish arrogance, [it] was in fact only a suggestion intended to prevent disputes, probably due to some official of the Papal chancery. It was never acted on by the parties and was withdrawn in the same year by the Pope himself. . . . The action of the Holy See in assuming to partition the globe between the sovereigns of Spain and Portugal has often been ridiculed. Such ridicule, it will be seen, is misplaced; and the Papal claim to universal dominion in its practical bearings represented nothing more than simple counter-claim against the more ancient and equally extravagant pretensions of the successors of Mohammed.*

* *Cambridge Modern History*, I, pp. 23, 24.

It is time, then, that some of this weight of prejudice was lifted from English minds ; that the commonwealth idea as it was worked from Rome in the Middle Age was treated with something of the same broad comprehension of difficulties that has been shown towards our own feeble effort to work a similar idea from Geneva ; and that it was recognized that the Papacy possessed what the League of Nations has not known how to provide—a wealth of corporate spiritual life upon which a commonwealth of Christendom might draw. The Reformation did civilization the extreme disservice of turning the Church into an armed camp. Instead of the everlasting need of human renovation being met from within by a deepening of the interior life of man as it did when St. Francis and St. Dominic started the religious revival of the thirteenth century, as it would have done if Luther had lent his aid to the conservative reformers of the sixteenth century, and as it might have done if Fénelon, the literary progenitor, in Acton's view of the French Revolution, had been influential enough to change the hard hearts of his countrymen. Society has fallen back upon the militant processes of "yin" and "yang" and wasted its spiritual substance in profligate controversies and more or less well-intentioned bloodshed. Only a deep yet far-reaching mysticism, however, will ever enable us to build the mystical City of God ; and the New Testament with its grave talk of wars and rumours of wars to the very end of time gives us no cause to suppose that men as a whole are ever likely to make the hard personal effort required of them as individuals, if the world is to be saved from itself. It will always be more acceptable to draw architectural designs and paint dream cities than to make bricks and lay them. Yet in fact the only plan for a City of God that has ever enjoyed any semblance of success was drawn almost two milleniums ago by a master-hand ; and, though the world has exhausted its best talents in providing substitutes, no one has yet produced a successful alternative. Talleyrand, with his keen eye for realism in politics, had doubtless a shrewd idea of the reason. When La Revellière produced a project under the cover of

theophilanthropy for the creation of some brave new world and invited the suggestions of his friends in what manner to recommend it to mankind, the ex-Bishop of Autun contented himself with observing that the Founder of Christianity had shown how such a thing might best be done by being crucified and rising again the third day.

ALGERNON CECIL.

THE WOOD

I, who have no charter of innocence,
Am afraid to enter the wood
Where the darkness is that of Golgotha
And every tree a rood ;

Where an owl's long moan is a cry of thirst
But thereby in its terror blest
That I should hear in sigh of every leaf
A consummatum est.

Fox in the clearing a son of Mary
And badger the brother of John :
Unworthy am I, O Lord of the trees,
To walk that way and on,

Interminably on through such a night
Of crowding branches, lest they hold
The dread of a multiplied atonement,
Of Passions manifold.

EGERTON CLARKE.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

The Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood. By the Rev. E. C. Messenger, Ph.D. Vol. II. (Longmans, Green. 30s.)

WHEREAS to his first volume Dr. Messenger added as a sub-title "The Revolt from the Mediaeval Church", to his second he adds "Rome and the Revolted Church". His first volume brought him to the end of the reign of Edward VI, and now, in the second, he begins his narrative with the restoration of Catholicism under Queen Mary. The twenty years of schism had produced a situation of enormous complexity and difficulty, and in view of this, one cannot help reflecting how much greater, if not insuperable, would be the difficulties if today, after so long a lapse of time, the Anglican communion as a whole would be willing to be reconciled to the Catholic Church. The ample faculties given to Cardinal Pole, and the use he made of them, are described with a fullness not easily found elsewhere. The importance of these proceedings may be judged from the influence upon the Commission of 1896 of the discovery by Cardinal Gasquet of documents concerning Pole's mission. Dr. Messenger has strengthened the argument, for he has shown that the one case in which Bishop Bonner has hitherto been supposed to have recognized Edwardine orders, that of Bishop John Scory, is mistaken, the person in question being not Scory of Chichester, but John Bird of Chester. Thus he is able to establish the important conclusion that no single case is known where Pole or his delegates acknowledged as priests or bishops those who had received only Edwardine orders.

There follow, amongst other things, an account of the alteration of religion under Elizabeth, an analysis of the various official statements of belief that appeared, and a catena of both Catholic and Anglican theologians which shows on the one side a unanimity in regarding Anglican bishops or priests as mere laymen, and on the other what Anglicans of today would regard as notably "low" doctrine. Later on come accounts of various suggestions for reunion during the reign of the Stuarts; of inquiries made by the Roman authorities into the validity of Anglican orders in two particular cases (that of Bishop Gordon being the better known); of the controversies connected with the name of Canon le Courayer (who espoused the validity of Anglican orders and *post hoc*—not, of course, *propter hoc*—abandoned even the Christian doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation); of the inception, progress, and conclusion of the discussions that produced the papal condemnation of 1896; of the Malines Conversations; and of the recent *rapprochement* between the Anglicans and the Orthodox.

All these and cognate matters Dr. Messenger has treated with remarkable fullness and thoroughness. He is at home in the voluminous literature that the long controversies have produced, and in many cases he is able to counter Anglican statements by the admissions of other Anglican writers. Though we may regret that, owing to the hope that Cardinal Merry del Val may one day be proposed for beatification, Dr. Messenger was unable to make use of his letters, yet he has used much unpublished material, and cleared up so many doubts and difficulties, that his work will be a mine of indispensable information to future students.

In brief, his achievement is to have shown, on the one hand, the consistent rejection of Anglican orders by the authorities of the Catholic Church and by the morally unanimous consent of her divines, and, on the other hand, the morally unanimous rejection by Anglican divines of transubstantiation and consequently of the doctrine of the true sacrifice of our Lord's body and blood in the Holy Mass.

As, however, it is a commonplace of theology that heresy in the minister or the recipient of a sacrament need not render it invalid, Dr. Messenger has completed his work by a very carefully worded and able Concluding Theological Essay. The papal condemnation was based on lack of form and intention. If no change had been made in the Catholic ordinal, erroneous belief in the minister need not have hindered the transmission of valid orders; and, on the other hand, if the intention of the minister had clearly been to transmit the sacrificing priesthood as the Catholic Church understood it, it is possible, though not certain, that the forms used by the Anglicans before 1662 might have sufficed. But the Church can judge of the intention of those who are responsible for the Anglican ordinals only by what they did, for she cannot judge *de internis*. As in fact they methodically excluded from the Catholic rites all that implied the transmission of the power to offer the sacrifice of the true body and blood of our Lord in the Mass, the Holy See gave its final and irreformable judgement (though not *de fide*, *pace* Father Cappello) that Anglican orders are null and void.

We hope that many Anglicans will study dispassionately the facts as Dr. Messenger has so fully and fairly stated them. We say "fairly" advisedly, for Dr. Messenger is in fact most moderate in his judgements and generous in his concessions. This, we hope, will outweigh in Anglican eyes an occasionally rather irritating use of marks of interrogation, and an attribution of dishonesty (unique, we think, in the book) on p. 294 to attempts to show that the Anglican Articles do not contradict Tridentine decrees.

We could wish, nevertheless, that Anglicans would leave aside

the question of their orders and direct their attention to the far more fundamental issue of schism. Valid orders, even united with orthodox belief, do not make a man a member of the Catholic Church.

P. E. HALLETT.

The Destiny of Man. By Nicholas Berdyaev. Translated by Natalie Duddington, M.A. (The Centenary Press: Bles. 16s. net.)

THIS book is the quintessence of its author's thought. Living throughout, it is full of profound insights; but they exist in a nebulous state mingled with dangerous errors. Berdyaev will contribute most valuable material to Christian philosophy; he cannot be accepted as a satisfactory Christian philosopher. He is right in tracing the origin of evil to the factor of non-entity, *to me on*, in created being, resulting in human freedom. But he introduces this "meonic" element and its freedom into the Absolute, which he distinguishes from God the Creator. This primordial Godhead contains, as it were, two poles: the Creator God and meonic being, including—indeed, culminating in—man and his freedom. Such a doctrine is at once too dualistic and too monistic. It is too dualistic, for it introduces into the Absolute two contrasted types of being. It is too monistic—that is to say, pantheistic—inasmuch as it regards created being as somehow contained as such in the Absolute prior to Creation. Berdyaev has, however, perceived that no satisfactory explanation of evil can be given which does not find its source in the metaphysical nature and root of the being subject to it; and, moreover, inasmuch as that being is inherently deficient, "meonic". But he has not seen clearly that this meonic being, apart from God's free creative *fiat*, was no more than an intrinsic possibility and is wholly external to the Divine Absolute. Indeed, he actually says that "pantheism is true of the God of apophatic (negative) theology"—that is, of the Absolute Godhead.

He objects to the doctrine that God is self-satisfied and self-sufficient, because self-satisfaction and self-sufficiency are sinful in man. It is strange that he fails to see that they are sinful in men because men are creatures, not God. Essentially limited and dependent for their being on an External Source, men ought not to deify themselves by behaving as though they possessed the fullness of being in and from themselves. God, however, as absolute and unlimited Being and Value, and as existing by and from himself, *a se*, must necessarily be self-satisfied and self-sufficient. Creation, by the way, does not imply a change in God. The sole change is

on the side of the creature brought into being by God's creative *fiat*.

Berdyayev has a powerful sense of the dynamic element in the world; he is bitterly opposed to anything that is rigid, static, and formal; but, like so many of our contemporaries, he exaggerates in the opposite direction and does not sufficiently admit the formal element of being and its primacy. "The world of values is not a changeless ideal realm rising above man and freedom; it is constantly undergoing change and being created anew." The order of forms to which values, like all other essences, belong must of its nature be immutable and eternal. Only its realization in concrete being is subject to change and fresh creation. And this concrete process depends for its possibility on the immutable ideal order of forms. To deny this and regard form as a creation of energy makes it impossible to accept any certain truth. Blind and arbitrary force is in the last resort supreme. It is the same metaphysical displacement which has exaggerated Berdyayev's justifiable dislike of moral legalism (magnificently expressed throughout the book) into a rejection of law. He fails to realize that the very condition of moral life and free choice is an objective law of ethical truth dependent upon the intrinsic nature of things, an order variously known as the law of nature, the *tao*, the *rita*, or *themis*. The error of legalism is not its conception of law as objective and immutable, but its identification of this intrinsic law of right reason with particular enactments which are but its imperfect and relative application. For example, the natural law, founded in the nature of man and his environment, demands some measure of private property. But it is sheer legalism to identify with this natural right a particular system by which property is in a concrete instance distributed. Berdyayev's inspiring summons from legalistic to creative and vital morality would have lost nothing of its force and gained enormously in accuracy had he understood better what is meant by the "law of life" and the "perfect law of liberty".

The chapter on man, though we would by no means vouch for every proposition it contains, least of all the section on sex, is full of magnificent and inspiring vistas. Man's unique sense of awe—though, perhaps for lack of a Russian equivalent, it is misleadingly termed fear or terror—with its religious implication, his essential createdness, are well brought out. "There is in man the element of primeval, utterly undetermined, potential freedom springing from the abyss of non-being and the element determined by the fact that he is the image and likeness of God, a Divine Idea which his freedom may realize or destroy." Berdyayev does not appear to have perceived that the concluding words affirm that primacy of

the ideal order over the energies which realize it that elsewhere he denies. But he has a splendid conviction of the superiority of individual personality to society and therefore to the State. Indeed, some of the most vigorous pages of the book are devoted to an indignant exposure of a sexual code founded in social rules and sanctions, and taking no account of the intimate rights of personality. It is, however, curious and symptomatic of Berdyaev's nebulous thinking that his assertion of the person against the State is immediately followed by a denial that the Absolute Godhead is personal. If personality is the highest value we know, the Absolute must be more akin to personality than to the impersonal.

Like Solovyev's, Berdyaev's attitude to sex is perverse. He holds with Boehme, who has influenced him considerably, that unfallen man was an integral bisexual virgin and that the division of the sexes was due to the Fall. Of the love between man and woman he has a most lofty conception, but he regards its external expression through physical action as something base and unworthy.

The view that redemption was God's justification at the bar of man "for the pain and misery" allowed in the world, though so far justifiable that Calvary threw a bright light on the problem of evil, is, as it stands, most unfortunate and unintentionally verging on the blasphemous. But the Ethics of Redemption contains a fine section directed against the hard-hearted pharisees who care only for their own salvation and complacently condemn sinners. "We must not think about our own salvation . . . we must think of the highest values and of the Kingdom of God for all creatures."

Equally inspiring is the section on grace and free will. "Where there is liberty there is the Spirit of God and grace. Grace acts upon liberty and cannot act upon anything else. . . . The freedom of will which has frequently led to man's enslavement must itself be liberated, i.e. endowed with gracious force. Creativeness is the gracious force which makes free will really free, free from fear, from the law, from inner dividedness."

An excellent passage pointing out the falsehood bound up with all *ex parte* statements is vitiated by a judgement which is itself a glaring instance of partisan misrepresentation. "*The whole of the Roman Catholic account of Papacy is based upon conventional lies and falsification which serve to create the myth of Papalism.*" Berdyaev's master, Solovyev, after years of conscientious study, reached a very different conclusion.

Berdyaev, too, repeats Newman's mistaken identification of conscience with the organ of religious experience. Conscience is

simply the function of moral judgement. But we would not end upon a note of criticism. Rather would we call attention to the passage towards the close of the book in which the author in genuinely prophetic strain proclaims "the transfiguration and regeneration of the world" as "beauty". *Caute legendum* certainly, *sed legendum*. *The Destiny of Man* opens an enthralling though mist-hung prospect of a world and mankind transformed by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit with man's creative free will.

E. I. WATKIN.

St. Benedict. By Dom Justin McCann. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.)

DURING the past fifty years the life and Rule of St. Benedict have been subjected to an intensive critical study by Benedictines and others, and there has been no lack of literature, written for the most part by scholars of distinction. Yet when all is said and done, we know almost nothing of the life and character of the great legislator save what is told us, all too enigmatically, by Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues*, and by St. Benedict himself, by implication, in his Rule. The chief services done by scholarship have therefore been the stripping away of all legend and the restoration of the Rule to the form in which it was originally composed.

Dom Justin McCann's recent study fills an empty niche by giving, in pages written by an Englishman for English readers, an adequate and yet succinct account of the life, times, and spirit of the saint. It is at once a piece of scholarship and a *travail de vulgarization*, and if it contains little that is, strictly speaking, new, it is nevertheless the outcome of mature consideration and of the study of much literature, including a number of foreign books and articles with which few in this country are acquainted. The opinions expressed are so sane, and couched in terms of such modest reasonableness, that they scarcely ever invite criticism, while the style is so easy that only when, in his rapid passage over the springing heather, he barks his shins against the outcrop of rock in the tenth chapter, will the unwary reader appreciate something of the work of criticism and synthesis that lies below much of the smooth surface.

Dom Justin's account of the life of St. Benedict is in every way strictly traditional. He puts forward no new conjecture or hypothesis and refuses to be led off the path by marsh lights. In all this he is very wise, even if at times he cannot help exposing our deplorable lack of trustworthy information as to what St. Benedict did or thought at the great crises of his

life. Regarding one such crisis, indeed, Dom Justin appears curiously hesitant. He places the move to Monte Cassino when St. Benedict was "nearly fifty years old" (p. 85), but is unwilling to pronounce whether he was "in the prime of life" (p. 91) or past it (p. 205), and tends to give considerable weight to a hint of Mark of Monte Cassino that he lived some time as a hermit there before forming a community (pp. 91, 170), though on another page (87) he speaks of the companions who accompanied him from Subiaco. This last fact is indeed given us by Gregory (*Dialogues*, II, 8), and is the only circumstance connected with the establishment at Monte Cassino that may be taken as certain. It is surely most natural to suppose that the new home was from the first a *coenobium*, however small; a return to the eremitical life as late as c. 530 would seem to run counter to all we know of the development of St. Benedict's life and thought.

The historians of early mediaeval monasticism, from Mabillon and Montalembert to Berlière and Butler, concentrated their attention on the catastrophe and chaos of the fifth and sixth centuries, and considered St. Benedict and his Rule as the grain of mustard seed whence sprang the tree which sheltered the relics of civilization till the advent of the second spring in the West. While not disallowing the broad truth of such a presentment, more recent scholarship has shifted the emphasis very considerably, and taught us that the liturgical, artistic, and above all the legal and administrative activity in Rome in the late fifth and early sixth centuries was very great, and that in the realm of centralized government and legal codification a summit of achievement was reached that was not passed until the age of Hildebrand. This, and the clear view of the "sources" of the Rule first given by Abbot Butler, have thrown a new light on the work and significance of St. Benedict. The late Abbot Chapman, in his book *St. Benedict and the Sixth Century*, put forward a number of theories in this connexion, linking the Rule with the Laws of Justinian, the collections of Dionysius, the Institutes of Cassiodorus, and the Rule of Caesarius of Arles. Specialists have had little difficulty in demolishing this or that hypothesis, and the general reader has flinched from the task of examining the multitude of Latin texts with which he has been confronted; but one who, with the intellectual movements of the time in mind, seriously ponders the character of St. Benedict's reading, the many traces of canonical phraseology in the Rule, and the striking resemblance between his aim and his scheme of government and those of Gelasius, Hormisdas, and Dionysius, will be readily disposed to see in the Rule a work of synthesis intended to be what in fact it soon became—the monastic equivalent of the newly codified canon

law; he may feel also that the legal (though not the spiritual) prototype of the abbot is to be sought not in the Roman *paterfamilias*, but in the monarchical city bishop. To such considerations we may feel Dom Justin gives too little weight; we may perhaps feel, also, that space might have been found for a sketch of contemporary Italian monasticism based not on the first chapter of the Rule (which has little reference to actual conditions), but upon the findings of recent studies of the economic, social, and religious life of the period.

In an interesting chapter (XI) St. Benedict's teaching is compared with that of Cassian, with whose writings Dom Justin is unusually familiar. This is a field in which monastic historians may still find room for fresh work. Cassian has been strangely neglected by all but the most recent students of monastic spirituality; the greater part of the work devoted to him in the past has been concerned with his alleged semi-Pelagian affinities. His writings present a number of problems and difficulties. Dom Justin, by using his *Collationes* as one might the *Entretiens* of St. Francis of Sales, tacitly assumes that his work forms a coherent system of doctrine to which all the Eastern monks of the Conferences have contributed and would subscribe. Thus the words of Abbot Moses in *Coll. I*, given by Cassian as the utterance of a saintly anchorite, are quoted (p. 173) as Cassian's own conviction as to the end to be aimed at by "every monk, be he hermit or cenobite", and on the same page the *omnis monachus* of Abbot Isaac in *Coll. IX* is counted as a cenobite, whereas it is clear that he is the *solitarius* of the parallel passage in Isaac's second conference (X); here again the teaching is the abbot's, not Cassian's.

Cassian's relations to St. Benedict are particularly deserving of attention; Dom Justin does not hesitate to call him "St. Benedict's chief teacher" (p. 172), and certainly if frequent citation and repeated commendation are proof of discipleship the title is deserved. Yet one familiar with Cassian cannot but be surprised at St. Benedict's selection and manipulation of quotations, and at what sometimes appears, at least on the surface, to be a failure to appreciate their deepest meaning.

M. D. K.

Saint Augustine of Hippo. By Father Hugh Pope, O.P. (Sands. 12s. 6d. net.)

WE all know that St. Augustine's story is one of the greatest in the world, but we tend to leave it when he has safely returned to Africa as a Catholic, and we almost forget that not yet half of his life is past. What was he like as a bishop? Did his heart cease to be

Augustine's when it was wholly given to Christ and his flock? What were the circumstances which he had to meet, the people who came under his charity and charm; what sermons did he preach, what letters did he write; what did he effect; who were his devoted friends? We had left out half Augustine—and here is a book to fill the gap.

"From the day of his consecration . . . Augustine's whole outlook on life underwent a radical change. Henceforth he simply lived for the spiritual needs of his flock—a flock which in time became almost co-extensive with northern Africa." To them he gave his whole genius: "If I have any knowledge of Holy Scripture, I must perforce expend it on the people of God; but my ecclesiastical preoccupations wholly preclude me from devoting myself to any other study." To Christ and to them went all his love: "May the Lord grant me so intense a love of you that I may be able even to die for you, if not in effect yet at least in desire."

First we must know about that flock, and in the opening chapter on "Roman Africa" and "Christian Africa" Fr. Pope uses a vast store of information geographical, archaeological, liturgical, and—still more important—a command of details gleaned from the saint's own writings. For example, he is able to show that Mass was celebrated daily and that St. Augustine is continually exhorting to daily communion. We see the degradation of society with which he had to cope, and also the great side of the African Church: "How many rich men, how many householders in the country districts, how many merchants, soldiers, governors of cities, senators, people of either sex, who have made the sacrifice of all earthly and transitory things!"

We pass to the bishop's work for his people, and to two excellent chapters on him as preacher and letter-writer. He is on intimate terms with his audience, he takes them into his confidence, and they respond eagerly and vociferously! There is a lively description of the letters of the period, and we have not read a better account of the correspondence with St. Jerome. We should have liked to quote from this, and from the admirable section on Augustine's humour. Fancy joking with St. Jerome! And who more pithy than Augustine: "How can you be proud unless you are empty? For if you were not deflated you could not be inflated."

In "The Crime of Schism" we have the saint struggling with the Donatists and answering in all charity their claims to be holy and Catholic, whereas "from that appalling sacrilege [of schism] none of you can pretend that he is free so long as he refuses to enter into communion with the Unity of all nations" and the only means of obtaining "the full and Catholic Unity of the Church is to be in

her". The terrible picture of the results of the schism lead us to the chapter "St. Augustine *Rex Pacificus*, or the Model of Tolerance" which anyone should read who has heard him traduced as a persecutor. We feel, however, that this chapter would have gained in strength if the definitive teaching of the Church, given in her code of canon law, "*Ad amplectendam Catholicam fidem nemo invitus cogatur*" had been stated, and it had been added that St. Augustine's view was at one time not entirely in accord with this.

The author of such a book must not only be an Augustinian scholar; he must share the saint's genial love of human nature, knowledge of the world, and Catholic common sense. It is for these qualities that it will be specially appreciated.

G. R. R.

John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism. By Maximin Piette. (Sheed & Ward. 18s. net.)

JOHN WESLEY is one of the very few supremely important non-Catholic Christians. There have been many great and holy non-Catholics, but not many have changed the course of religious history. It is an excellent thing that a thoroughly competent Catholic historian should study the life of such a man. Fr. Maximin Piette is a Belgian Franciscan, and the present book is the thesis which he offered for his doctorate of theology at Louvain in 1925. That great Methodist Dr. Workman contributes an appreciative introduction, as does Bishop Kelley of Oklahoma, the founder of the Catholic Church Extension Society and himself a doctor of Louvain. The work has been done with great thoroughness; all the vast literature has been carefully examined, including much unpublished material in the Bodleian and the British Museum.

The result is a very remarkable book. It has its faults. The first part consists of a rather hasty survey of the various forms of sixteenth-century Protestantism—Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, Calvinism, and Anabaptism—which does not throw very much light on Methodism. On the other hand, the account given of the Moravians, who really had a profound influence on John Wesley, is hardly adequate. But the core of the book, the picture of Wesley himself, is not open to these objections. Fr. Piette writes with generous enthusiasm and full knowledge, and his narrative, while scrupulously documented, is deeply moving and impressive.

Indeed, Wesley himself is a fascinating study; brought up in the tradition of solid sacramental high-Church Anglicanism, and

Vol. 202 2A

inflexibly opposed to "Solifidianism" and Calvinism to the end of his days, he was deeply impressed by the devotion of the Moravians, Lutheran pietists whom he met on his disastrous voyage to America. He rejected their theology, but the few days that he spent at their settlement at Herrnhut changed the whole current of his life. On his return he was driven, like such saints as Vincent de Paul or Alphonsus, to preach the gospel to the poor; and the poor in the slums and countryside of his England were incredibly ignorant and degraded. And then he found that his preaching produced an extraordinary effect on his hearers. Men dropped to the ground in the middle of his sermons as if shot, writhing and shrieking in agony, till they "received a full, clear sense of God's pardoning love", and rose to their feet with shouts of joy. This "New Birth" became the foundation of his spiritual teaching, and was the cause of Methodism becoming an independent sect. Eighteenth-century Anglican bishops, even such a great and good man as Butler, feared nothing so much as "enthusiasm", and when a former fellow of Lincoln travelled from end to end of the country, preaching in the open air with these disconcerting results, we cannot be surprised that they were discouraging.

Fr. Piette gives a brief sketch of Wesleyanism since Wesley. It is, like the rest of the book, a learned and thorough-going survey, involving the painstaking study of a mass of documentary evidence. It gives us all we can fairly expect. A historian working from his written authorities cannot do much more than chronicle the melancholy story of schisms and quarrels; and indeed they were absorbing enough to the Methodists of a nineteenth-century north-country town. And yet there is something far more vital. Bitter as were the differences between the Wesleyans and Wesleyan Reformers, both sides were men of the same social and religious *ethos*, and that *ethos* was a very important factor in the life of England. The typical Methodist tradesman of the nineteenth century has gone without leaving any written record. His religion was harsh, narrow, unlovely in many ways; it had a profound fear and hatred of the Faith. Yet it often had a sincerity and religious gravity which made it a fine thing.

COLUMBA STENSON, O.S.B.

The Early Stuarts 1603-1660. By Godfrey Davies, M.A. (The Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d. net.)

MR. DAVIES has given us the volume dealing with the first half of the seventeenth century in the new Oxford History of England which is being published by the Oxford University Press under the general editorship of Professor G. N. Clark. It is useful that

this volume should have been published early, since those dealing with the Elizabethan and later Stuart period have already appeared, and it is now possible to consider the treatment of the whole period between 1558 and 1714.

In general the editor and his assistants must be congratulated on the balanced and objective accounts which they have produced and on the very smooth way in which one book dovetails into another. There is a really remarkable consistency in outlook and treatment. The chief difficulty, however, lies in introducing an adequate and convincing account of the social and cultural background into a close-packed political narrative which itself has to be rigorously curtailed. Among the volumes which have so far appeared, that by Mr. R. C. K. Ensor, *England, 1870-1914*, has mastered this problem with most success. It is naturally much easier to weld into a consistent whole an appreciation of the late Victorian period, which is still so familiar, than it is to apply a similar treatment to earlier centuries.

Mr. Davies has planned his book in parallel chronological series, devoting the first section to a study of political and constitutional history between 1603 and 1629, and the second and third sections to foreign relations and the religious developments of those years. He then repeats the process for the period from 1630 to 1660, concluding the volume with surveys of social and economic history, foreign trade and colonies, education and science, the arts and literature. The book is very careful and balanced and is in general in the tradition of the late Professor S. R. Gardiner. The reasoning is close and careful and the whole character of the book is rational and calm. This quality is very apparent in the treatment of the religious controversies, and it is in keeping with it that no consideration is given to the mystical element in the Quaker approach and that there should be no reference to Nicholas Ferrar or Little Gidding. On the other hand, the development of the legislation dealing with religious matters is set out most clearly.

The section dealing with Catholics is both accurate and fair in treatment, although it is open to question whether Charles I was not considerably more opposed to Catholic doctrine than Mr. Davies suggests. The section on the arts, and especially the pages devoted to architecture, is very attractive; but perhaps the most valuable portion of the book is the admirable treatment of social and economic history. This is particularly satisfying in comparison with the section devoted to politics, in which the author tends to show an undue preference for traditional views. The book is singularly free from misprints and has the careful and detailed index which we associate with this series. In the bibliog-

raphy mention might have been made of Dr. Albion's work on *Charles I and the Court of Rome* in the section devoted to Catholicism. In general, however, the notes in the bibliography are singularly complete.

DAVID MATHEW.

Towards the Twentieth Century ; Essays in the Spiritual History of the Nineteenth. By H. V. Routh, M.A., D.Litt. (Cambridge University Press. 21s. net.)

DR. ROUTH appears to belong to that fashionable band of critics who are all for tracing schools of thought, theorizing about intellectual tendencies, codifying, systematizing, docketing, and assigning their subjects to this category or that. *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*. No doubt ; but happy too is he who is able clearly to communicate what he knows. Dr. Routh's thesis is not an easy one ; it is not rendered easier by the manner of its exposition. Too often the reader is baffled and bewildered by a flood of words which lose themselves in a quagmire of no-meaning. What, for example, is this intended to convey ? :

For while his position was supreme and he must have enjoyed the most that a human being can expect from life, intense intellectual activity leading to a vision of what is best on earth and in heaven.

Here, possibly, the printer is to blame ; but there are too many instances which admit of no such explanation. Here is one :

He [Tennyson] impressed Carlyle as being full of ideas—"speech and speculation free and plenteous". He even succeeded in bringing something of the new philosophic atmosphere into his verse, hinting as it were at their point of view.

These things may be trifles, and so they are taken one by one, but cumulatively and in the long run they become intensely irritating—so irritating that when we are told of Newman that "he was an earnest theologian who starved his literary genius" and that "without sacrificing one iota of sincerity or scholarship he staked his spiritual life on formularies and ritual", one hesitates to comment on a statement so grotesque for fear of being tempted into making too heated a retort. We should have thought that anyone who had the smallest knowledge of Newman (whose *Apologia* and *Idea of a University*, we presume, are products of his

"literary starvation") would have known that ritual, as ritual, was one of the least of his concerns, as it was of Pusey and indeed of all the older tractarians.

Let it be said, however, that much of this book is excellent and, in the best sense of the word, provocative. The author's studies of George Eliot and of Gissing, for example, could scarcely be bettered. But why—oh, why—did he try to lay the poets under contribution, and attempt to study them, "not as literature-makers only, but as individuals in search of the new destiny for man which Science and industrial power were demanding"? In this, it appears, they failed, and we may be devoutly thankful that they did. A poet is not a scientist, and it is not the poet's business to concern himself with scientific theories, still less with the demands of "industrial power", whatever they may be. If it were, then Dante and Shakespeare, to say nothing of Homer and Virgil, would be sadly demoded in these days. Are we to disregard the poetry of Milton because his theory of the universe is not that of Professor Einstein? We might as well refuse to listen to a Beethoven symphony because it tells us nothing about the theory of electrons. Even to Lucretius we do not go for his views on the atomic theory, but for his poetry and for what he has to tell us of man, of nature, and of human life. Poetry is a criticism of life, not a commentary on scientific theories or industrial conditions. Because it inadequately fulfilled this latter desideratum, *In Memoriam* has fallen into comparative oblivion: so, at least, Dr. Routh appears to think. One thing, however, is quite certain, and that is that, if it had fulfilled that requirement any less imperfectly, the oblivion would have been complete and irremediable. I began with *Felix qui potuit . . .* I will end with *Fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestes*—or, as Wordsworth puts it:

One impulse from a vernal wood
Will teach us more of man,
Of moral evil and of good,
Than all the sages can.

J. LEWIS MAY.

Men and Tendencies. By E. I. Watkin. (Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d. net.)

MR. WATKIN says of Havelock Ellis that "he is within the Kingdom though he may fail to recognize the King". This might indeed be taken as a general formula for the first seven rather light essays in this volume. Coming as it does from a philosopher whose philosophy is one of mystical intuition, it may be judged as

sympathetic criticism—that is to say, good criticism—rather than mere approval of what the critic agrees with.

For H. G. Wells's vision of an utopian social ideal is interpreted as a chafing against human limitations, though rejected as intrinsically doomed to frustration; Galsworthy is portrayed as an artist able to "give shape to his vision of life", but lacking the higher vision that would enable him to integrate all his experience; Aldous Huxley is praised for his rejection of one-sided views claiming completeness and for his consequent acceptance of an experience, criticized for the too petty conception of life which makes him exclude the mystical experience whose object is Life Itself; Lord Russell is shown as a man knowing religious experience and regarding it as of supreme value, yet led by a too restricted notion of experience to an illegitimate denial of its objective validity. Professor J. B. S. Haldane fits into the formula inasmuch as he accepts religious experience; he is criticized for a scientific outlook which renders his "scientific religion" unscientific and bad philosophizing. Santayana, artist-philosopher, has glimpsed the vision of Plato but missed its solidity.

These essays are followed by two on Peter Wust and Plotinus respectively, philosophers by whom Mr. Watkin has evidently been much influenced and whose importance for Christian philosophy he recommends. Wust's contemplative method is described with its dependence on speculative theology and anthropology, and his dialectic of the human spirit is sketched with admirable lucidity.

The last four essays are concerned with political philosophy. Dialectical ideal-realism is shown as alone capable of providing the synthesis of Hegel's dialectical idealism and Marx's dialectical materialism, the liberty of the Kingdom of God as the philosophers' stone which can take the iron framework of the totalitarian state and convert it into a free organic society.

Even a Dominican may come near to being convinced that a Catholic philosophy is possible: Mr. Watkin writes always as a philosopher yet always as a Christian, his Catholicism informing all his thought without seeming to detract from its philosophical character. On the other hand, the very personal interpretation he gives to *philosophia perennis* in the Platonic and Augustinian tradition will, perhaps, for readers unfamiliar with his thought, blunt the edge of criticism, criticism that consists fundamentally of exhibiting views accepted and integrated by himself as partial and insufficient when taken in isolation.

There must be very few to whom all the subjects discussed and authors criticized are familiar from first-hand study. Mr. Watkin's criticism is convincing enough to make one envisage its

subjects as on the defensive ; yet one wonders if they might not make a vigorous defence. To ignore criticism is perhaps the best defence against the attacks of lesser scribes, but Mr. Watkin's *Philosophy of Form* entitles him to the courtesy of a reply.

QUENTIN JOHNSTON, O.P.

Jonathan Swift. By Bertram Newman. (Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d. net.)

It is as true of biography as of history that to endure it must be written with love or hate, and Swift has inspired both. That the abiding enigma of that "conjured spirit" has gripped the imagination of this age, the many *Lives* published within the last ten years, the spate of special studies in learned periodicals and the careful scholarship which has gone to the editing of the Dean's works, are proof enough.

Mr. Newman, believing that until this labour of research has given us something approaching an authentic canon of his writings there can be no definitive life of Swift, modestly disclaims in his preface all pretensions to an original contribution to the subject, and takes as his apologia for another *Life* the fascination of the subject. Though circumstances delayed its publication, the greater part of his own book was written before 1931, and its judgements are thus independent of the later *Lives*. In the intervening years Mr. Newman must have steeped himself in Swift and, as Stevenson did with words, worn him next his skin, for his is of the biographies written with love.

Seeking only "to cast here and there a clearer ray of light on as complex and enigmatic a character as has ever challenged portrayal", he has attained the lucidity that comes only of a knowledge wide and deep enough to be selective. The political intricacies of Swift's age—from a time when the execution of Charles I was yet remembered to that of George II, with his hatred of "poets and painters"—are sketched with a firm hand, while the brief expositions of such questions as the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, the outlook of the Age of Reason, Deism and Wood's Coinage would be hard to better within so brief a scope.

To read a life of Swift must always be an experience of pain. As Lamb could not read to the end of *Lear*, there comes a point, as in the sentence on Patrick's bringing from a dark cupboard a caged creature "as though he had forgot he was a bird", or in a letter of 1730 to Bolingbroke, "You think, as I ought to think, that it is time for me to have done with the world, and so I would if I could get into a better before I was called into the best and not die

here in a rage, like a poisoned rat in a hole", when Kent's words come unbidden :

"Vex not his ghost : Oh let him pass ! he hates him
That would upon the rack of this tough world
Stretch him out longer."

Mr. Newman's is a reverent biography. In an age of psycho-analysis his work is informed, yet without morbid insistence on pathology. Indeed, the medical appendices to the *Life*, written by specialists, are studies of Ménière's disease and cerebral arteriosclerosis, not of the mental complexes of genius.

It is the same with the treatment of Stella and Vanessa. The author's *nescio*, a very well-documented *nescio*, is welcome after the commentators who would unlock Swift's heart, for there are many who share Browning's distaste for taking the roofs off others' houses. Yet there is no bloodlessness in the portrayal of the Dean, whose intensity of feeling was such that the loss of a friend was like the loss of a limb.

The long tale unfolds from student days in Trinity to the dignity of Sir William Temple's household, the crowded stage of London and the coffee-house wits, to the deanery of St. Patrick's, where—as the champion on an impoverished and ill-used Ireland—Swift became the idol of the people, who on his birthday rang all the bells of Dublin till the steeples rocked. Fierce polemics, unmatched irony, rapier wit, friendship, good talk, much secret kindness—so went the years till, one by one, familiar friends died, and of Stella there remained "only a woman's hair". Last scene of all—oblivion : broken at times by the voice of an undefeated consciousness : "I am what I am", and the final quiet of his cathedral :

*"ubi saeva indignatio
ulterius
cor lacerare nequit."*

The life of a great spirit is here finely written, and for those who would read further "of Presto and that other I" there are scholarly notes and an admirably arranged bibliography. Of all Mr. Newman's biographies this is undoubtedly the most sensitive, and should take worthy place among Swiftiana.

VERA S. M. FRASER.

The Muse in Chains. By Stephen Potter. (Cape. 7s. 6d. net.)
"An English education ! Glorious prize !" wrote Nahum Tate, if Mr. Potter is not bluffing. For too many of us English education

has meant preparing to explain with reference to the context, poring over the editors' helpful jottings, unable to see the wood for the tangle of philological trees and allusive undergrowth. "Satyr" refers of course to the cloven-footed *satyri* of Greek mythology"; or perhaps "Satyr (the cloven-footed, etc.) is here mentioned by Shakespeare for the first time. Or the last time. Or for the only time. Or note how frequently he uses it." One wants to go on quoting all Mr. Potter's examples. "Let me have a child at fifty, to whom Herod of Jewry may do homage . . . I love long life better than figs"; so Charmian in *Antony and Cleopatra*; and the editor: "On this jesting wish . . . Steevens observes: 'This is one of Shakespeare's natural touches. Few circumstances are more flattering to the fair sex than breeding at an advanced period of life.'" And so on. Then there is the Lambinator: he "goes in tremendously for the human side. . . . There is always the implication that the real writing, the real good, is the Lamby kind of writing, his own kind of writing, in which quietness, contemplation, and humour dashed with sadness and a touch of Ah-the-Past is the thing"; he is allusive: "Ben Jonson is called 'Ben', Donne is 'Jack Donne', Jane Austen . . . is 'Miss Austen' . . ." What is the thing of which all these types of writing are expression? "What it is *not* is English Literature"; it is its attendant shadow, and Mr. Potter christens it with a shadow name, eng. lit., or Inglit, or, for short, Lit. To describe Lit, to tell its life-story, its academic career as Lit. Ang., is the purpose of his book. And while the history is of extreme interest, the description is entrancing. Lit has "its own psychology, standards of value, ethic: its own histories". "The power of creative writing is regarded as a gift, bestowed at birth by a fairy godmother"; all we others can do is to be critics; and so there is the fixed Order of Merit of the poets, the history which reduces all the writers and "influences" to an orderly pattern, the history which concentrates on the human side—"Poet he was in very truth; but he was also a steady-going man of affairs, richly endowed with the homely virtue of common sense." Not so very different from the biographer himself."

This world, Mr. Potter tells us, is passing. "The waters are sinking. The arcane source is drying up." Harassed schoolmasters may think there are still a fair number of late showers to keep the waters flowing. At any rate, Mr. Potter does more than crystallize Lit in its criminal absurdity and write its epitaph; he has valuable constructive suggestions. Writing and reading must go together; the study of the necessary facts should be reduced to the minimum; the stupidity of examinations should be replaced by "the accumulated record, the results of the apprenticeship in

writing, and the word of the teachers or tutors with whom the student has worked”.

This is more than a delightful book to be read with amusement and joy; the problem is a serious one. G. V.

The Place of Saint Thomas More in English Literature and History.

By R. W. Chambers. (Longmans Green & Co. 5s. net.)

WHEN Lord Russell of Killowen and Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., chairman and secretary respectively of the Thomas More Society, decided to expand a Friday *dîner maigre* into a great reception to be held in the Old Hall of Lincolns Inn, and invited Professor Chambers to give a lecture, they did better than they knew, for that lecture has been expanded into this delightful book; so that what was relished as a substitute for fish by a few can now be digested by many.

Four sections make up the book. "More and his Father at Lincolns Inn" is the first; and one imagines that this at least is taken verbatim from the lecture, and that it must have proved more piquant to the lawyers than any fish sauce ever did. The second section is adorned with a conversation piece: "Sir John and Sir Thomas More with their Descendants", from the Burford Priory picture, depicting five generations, ranging from the year 1451 to the year 1649. Professor Chambers uses it effectively to demonstrate the continuity of our history, and to show Thomas More as a link between mediaeval and modern England. In English literature, he maintains, More's place is now assured. The great patriarchs of literature have done him justice. Not so the patriarchs of history; and Clio is still in thrall to Froude and Creighton. The third section deals with this, and the reason for it—the necessity of bolstering up Henry VIII as the reformer whom we must thank for the Protestant religion, for our religious liberties, and for our parliamentary institutions. So More's death was "not an act of tyranny. It was an inevitable and painful incident of an infinitely blessed revolution." (Froude.)

The great lawyers, however, have given a very different verdict; and this forms the theme of section four. "To the lawyers the essential thing is, that against a man to whom an oath was sacred, a verdict of 'guilty' was obtained by perjury." The parallel is drawn between the case of Antigone and that of Thomas More. The one is the great example in literature, the other in history, of the claims of conscience against the law of the state. St. Thomas died "for his belief that there is a Divine and a natural law which cannot be set aside to provide a short cut for the despotism of the omniscient State". And *that* promises to be of increasing importance in the near future. C. E. E.

The Mystery of the Church. By Humbert Clérissac, O.P. (Sheed & Ward. 3s. 6d. net.)

It is only because of our human limitations that we consider the Church as an historical institution to be defended by an appeal to documentary evidence and the observation of the senses. In reality the Church is eternal as God is eternal and, like all conceptions of the Divine Mind, is a profound mystery. As a mystery, says Père Clérissac, it is an example to be admired—an object of deep and loving contemplation—and an efficient cause which has a far-reaching influence on the lives of men. His book is devoted to the exposition of this thesis.

The Church is first considered in the mind of God, planning to save the world through His Son and therefore through the society which continues the effectiveness of the Incarnation. It follows from this thought that Christ is in the Church and the Church in Christ; hence her exclusiveness, her universality, unity, apostolicity and holiness. Each of these attributes implies the others and Christ's presence is the reason for them all. It is the reason, too, of her personality and therefore of her teaching authority; the latter cannot be a book, subject to the use or misuse of those who study it, but must be a personal living voice. The hieratic life of the Church means a perfect order descending from Christ, through His priests to all the members, each of whom participates to some degree in the character of Christ as priest and victim. Even those who seem to be living remote from this order cannot exist without "the mystery of the Church, prolonging itself into the depths of the Thebaid". (p. 90). Particularly beautiful (and most valuable) is the chapter on the Maternity of the Church, which breaks away from the usual discussions about the limits of state authority and attributes to the Church a supreme position and even (apparently) direct power in temporals (p. 122).

The introduction by Jacques Maritain and the excellent translation will help the reader greatly to enjoy an essay of the highest value for study or devotion.

EDWARD QUINN.

The Church and Reunion. By Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s. net.)

A book on this subject by an author so well known to Christians of all denominations in England should attract many readers, especially when the author is also a man of learning and of manifest apostolic zeal. We have here reprinted for us the thoughts of Father Vincent on certain aspects of reunion as they have

forced themselves on public attention during the past thirty years.

Of the articles that date from the pre-war period, the most interesting are those that concern the Catholic and the Non-conformists. Setting aside doctrinal difficulties, Fr. Vincent prefers to dwell on the positive qualities and virtues of the Free Churches; this is of particular interest in view of the appreciation of John Wesley recently shown by some Catholic writers. One or two of the older articles might have been omitted with profit—for instance, a review of a book by that very pre-war prophet and seer W. H. Mallock. Does anybody read him today? Surely he is quite unreadable to most of this generation.

But the reunion movement has been “news” since the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and most of Father Vincent’s articles are on events and publications since that date. It is interesting to find him holding “Malines Conversations” with Archbishop Davidson, the present Bishop of London, the late Lord Halifax, and two learned Anglican divines, Professor C. H. Turner, and Dr. H. S. Scott. Although he never sinks differences, Father Vincent knows how to sink all ill-feeling and bitterness: “If Faith has its rights, Charity has its duties.”

C. A. BOLTON.

Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought. By Frank Gavin, Th.D. (S.P.C.K. 10s. net.)

DR. GAVIN’S Hale Lectures were first published in book form fourteen years ago, and this reissue is photographically reproduced from that first edition; this means that the book has not been brought up to date, which is disappointing. Nevertheless, the reissue is more than welcome: to anybody who wants to get an idea of Orthodox theology, and has not got the time or the patience or the languages to wade through Palmieri and Kattenbusch and Jugie, Dr. Gavin’s book is quite indispensable. But it also has great value in its own right and to experts, especially at the present time, when nearly all the Orthodox theological thought that appears in English emanates from one or other of the Slav schools. Most of the matter contained in it is timeless and the book is substantially what it was on first publication, a scholarly, reliable, well-documented account of the teaching of the more outstanding contemporaneous Greek Orthodox theologians, Androusos, Dyobounites, Mesolora and others.

L. E.

The Catholic Church in Modern Scotland. By Peter F. Anson. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d. net.)

It is some years since Donald Attwater gave us an account of *The Catholic Church in Modern Wales*; a companion volume concerning Scotland was very desirable, and no one is better qualified to write it than Peter Anson. In general he follows a similar arrangement to Mr. Attwater's book—Part I is concerned with the post-reformation Church in Scotland till the appointment of the first vicar apostolic in 1694 (this title is printed throughout "vicar-apostolic"—which means an "apostolic" who is a vicar); Part II deals with each of the vicariates or districts in turn, until 1878, with a chapter on the Scots colleges abroad; Part III gives an account of each of the dioceses of the revived hierarchy.

Mr. Anson has made a valuable addition to the historical library of the British Isles—as he himself says, it is as it were a draft for "a new and detailed history of the Catholic Church in Scotland which is badly needed"; but the book is excellent as it stands, and there is no longer any excuse for, for example, Bishop Hay, Bishop Gillis, and Bishop James Grant being no more than names (if that) to Sassenachs. Much careful research and reading has been expended on it, and Mr. Anson has the inestimable advantage of knowing intimately the country and people of whom he writes; this has enabled him to supplement what he says of religious life in Scotland in the past with a first-hand account of her social and religious condition today, his final chapter. The section herein on public worship among Catholics in Scotland is sad reading, but throughout the book we get the impression that, in spite of the Irish immigration, the Church there preserves a predominantly Scottish character—very different from Wales.

The volume is illustrated by twelve of the author's characteristic drawings of churches, etc.; it is a pity that one of Oban cathedral was not included—the best Catholic cathedral in Great Britain, after Westminster.

F. W.

The Early Dominicans. By R. H. Bennett. (Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. net.)

MR. BENNETT gives a very clear description of Dominican activities between 1221 and 1280, and particularly good are his chapters on the friars' learning and preaching. I think, however, his book would have gained much in value had he relied less on the late-fourteenth-century John Bromyard, whose *Summa Praedicatorum* is rapidly becoming a common quarry, and given us some information gleaned from the extant works of many thirteenth- or early four-

teenth-century Dominican preachers both abroad and at home. Dr. M. R. James, in his invaluable catalogues, gives the names of many English Dominican sermon-collections, particularly in the Cambridge libraries, where we may instance MS. no. 210 in Peterhouse, which contains 119 sermons by Robert Holcot composed nearly fifty years before the *Praedicatorium* and the still earlier sermons of Simon Boraston in MS. no. 160 of the same library. Thomas Walleys's two works, *De modo componendi Sermones* and *De arte praedicandi*, are still extant, and Cardinal Gasquet used the latter in one of his essays in *The Old English Bible*. The author inclines to accept 1368 as the probable date for Bromyard's great work, but confesses it was a life work, and admits Bromyard was living forty-one years later; Dr. Coulton's suggestion of 1390 or thereabouts is, I feel sure, a correct one.

The wrapper in which the book is purveyed has printed on it the absurd claim that Mr. Bennett "suggests the reasons for its [the Dominican Order's] final decay". A body that decays about 1280 and is still doing useful work in 1938 is an anomaly indeed.

WALTER GUMBLEY, O.P.

A Saint Under Moslem Rule. By Dom Justo Pérez de Urbel.
(Coldwell. 10s. net.)

ON its original publication ten years ago *San Eulogio de Cordoba*, from which this volume is adapted, won a special prize offered by the Madrid *Voluntad* for the best life of a Spanish saint. A labour of love evidently as much as the fruit of fine scholarship, by a monk of Silos (the senior abbey of the Solesmes Benedictines in Spain), it has found sympathetic as well as admirably competent translation at the abbey of Stanbrook, so that the difficulties inherent in such a recasting, and yet more in the subject with which it deals, have been very largely overcome.

No one would call the age of Charlemagne easy to popularize for the modern world, least of all with the scene staged in the Iberian peninsula, then and for centuries afterwards isolated from the rest of Europe and the prey to a life-and-death struggle between Christian and Moor. In several striking chapters, however, Dom Justo Pérez makes the martyrs who fell in that struggle for the first time a reality to the ordinary reader; elsewhere he takes occasion to quote splendid passages from the Mozarabic liturgy, placing it in a peculiarly interesting setting when describing his hero's visit to the Navarran monastery of Leyre, where the Rule of Saint Benedict was kept but the ritual of the Visigoths retained till the eleventh century. A book well worth the slight effort necessary to its enjoyment.

G. M. DURNFORD.

The Diary of a Country Priest. By Georges Bernanos. Translated by Pamela Morris. (Boriswood. 10s. 6d. net.)

Of all lives surely the most difficult to make acceptable to the general reader is the life of a Catholic priest. And the reason is not far to seek. All the world, believers and unbelievers, Catholic and non-Catholic, demand of a priest that his standards shall be supernatural; it is the corollary of his sacerdotal claims. It is not a question of degrees of holiness, it is a matter of an entirely different plane of living, so that to write of him, as one would say, naturally, is to give an unnatural picture which offends our sense of fitness and even of decency. This innate and inescapable difficulty must be the measure of our admiration for this remarkable book. It is extraordinary that it should have been written by a layman; it is even more extraordinary that the author should have forgotten, abandoned, destroyed all his criteria of natural conduct and secular wisdom and looked at the world from the very heart of this nervous, shrinking, pain-racked, yet indomitably heroic priest. The book is a document of unutterable sadness which yet brings with it the sense of unimaginable peace, for perfect peace cannot be imagined so long as we are unable or unwilling to cut ourselves free from the entangling and ephemeral solaces of this world. The world can see in the episode of Abraham's sacrifice nothing but the story of a mind tortured and crazy with moral introspection, and the only lesson that the natural man can derive from it is that a merciful God will send his angel to prevent the unnecessary sacrifice. But in the supernatural order the sacrifice was necessary and was made. One cannot explain these mental processes; still less can one argue about them; they are, as St. Paul said, to some a stumbling-block, to others foolishness. One can only depict them, and that is the supreme merit of this book. It is a picture, not a thesis, and like the Cross itself it silences all argument because it refuses to parley, to compromise or to defend. The poor maimed body is battered and crushed and suffers the last indignity of death, and when the noise is stilled and the dust has settled the soul is seen, whole and triumphant.

Though there are many quotable passages in the book, one refrains for fear of giving a wrong impression. The book is not written, as some are, to make a background for a few incisive and telling criticisms of religious thought and practice. Where such judgements occur they arise naturally from the narrative, which is, as we have said, a picture and not a thesis, and as a picture must be seen and judged as a whole.

S. J. G.

In Parenthesis. By David Jones. (Faber & Faber. 10s. 6d. net.)

THE easiest way (perhaps by now the only way) out of the difficulty of reviewing a book so superbly good and so indefinable as this is to say that it deserves the "good press" it has received; it is the general opinion that it is the best book of which the war of 1914-18 has been the occasion, and that opinion is not confined to professional critics. And it is not a "war-book" as that expression has come to be understood, a propaganda pamphlet, a romance, a piece of exhibitionism, a cry from the outraged (it could not be so good if it were); it is just a piece of objective writing of things seen, heard, felt, tasted, smelt, suffered, and thought on the Western Front in December 1915 to July 1916.

Others, indeed, have tried to do the same thing, but even so there is a difference. Mr. Jones has succeeded in saying the unsayable, and that by means of reconciling the irreconcilable: he shows "English" men at war in a literary form that for want of a better word must be called "modernist" (liberties taken with grammar, spelling, punctuation, arrangement of words and sentences), and in terms on the one hand of modern warfare and contemporary persons and on the other of those things that have helped to form us all, the words and ideas of the bardic poetry of our British ancestors, of the Mabinogion, of Malory and folk-song and Shakespeare, of the liturgy of the Roman Church. But *In Parenthesis* is not "literary", it is living and human—that is one of Mr. Jones's triumphs. Of all the fine things in the book which is the best? The coming of the first shell? Or Dai's autobiography ("boast") from Michael the Archangel and Abel by way of Golgotha to Camlan? Or the introduction of rubrics from the Good Friday office before the troops go up into the front line? Or the dedication of the book? I don't know. But I do know that it is true that:

"Together they bore in their bodies the genuine tradition of the Island of Britain, from Bendigeid Fran to Jingle and Marie Lloyd. These were the children of Doll Tearsheet. Those are before Caractacus was. Both speak in parables, the wit of both is quick, both are natural poets; yet no two groups could well be more dissimilar."

That truth and all its implications survived war barbarism; it will survive post-war barbarism—it may destroy it; for, in the phrase of another poet, "We are the people of England—and we have not spoken yet." But a Welshman has uttered a mighty word in this book, in the course of his search for "how we may see formal goodness in a life singularly inimical, hateful to us".

D. D. A.

Half a Life Left. By James Strachey Barnes. (Eyre & Spottiswoode. 10s. 6d.)

Sons of the Eagle. By Ronald Matthews. (Methuen. 12s. 6d.)

MR. BARNES, following up *Half a Life*, here recounts his experiences in Albania and Abyssinia. Of the former country he had first-hand experience in the days when Ahmed Zoghu was not yet king and the frontiers were under discussion in the peace conference; in Abyssinia he followed the war with the Italian army as Reuter's correspondent. And in each case the interest of his book lies in what he has to tell of his own individual adventures. His reflections, conclusions, point of view, are another matter. The book is full of misspellings, the style is often a misery; the manner, a sublime self-assurance, is tiring. But what is more important, while there is every need of reasoned presentation in English of the Italian point of view and of the real and valuable achievements of Mussolini, here there is uncritical partisanship, and a continually evident naiveté and lack of perception which must merely make the unbiassed reader suspicious of the author's judgements.

Sons of the Eagle is very different. Superficially a "travel book", it not only offers a first-hand and attractively written account of extensive journeyings throughout Albania, but includes also a fascinating account of Albanian legends, customs, religion, the tragedy of present problems, economic and political, the epics of past history, and presents these through the convincing testimony of the men of all types and classes with whom the author came into sympathetic contact. What is most convincing, the author finds as he leaves Albania that he can come to no cut-and-dried solution of the problems with which he has been confronted; while answering very differently from Mr. Barnes the question. "What is Italy doing?" (altruistic friendship or commercial and political exploitation), he can only ask himself what in any case *could* be done to remedy the terrible lot of the poor, while yet avoiding the evils of our civilization and an economic serfdom to another nation. This is a book which one can recommend: a fascinating introduction to a fascinating and tragic country, a picture which is all the more convincing because not employed to urge a slick and *simpliste* political slogan.

G. V.

Lost Atlantis. By James Bramwell. (Cobden Sanderson. 7s. 6d. net.)

IN spite of everything that sceptical historians and unromantic scientists may say, the belief, or at any rate the wish to believe, in a lost continent will remain part of our common inheritance. The mystery is too fascinating to allow it to be forgotten, and even

if it never got beyond the stage of being a hypothesis it would continue to provide an explanation that *might* be true of other mysteries in religion, in folk-lore, in ethnology and in geology. Woven into the stories that have come down to us from long-dead civilizations is the belief in some desirable land of the West, a Utopia alike for the moralist and the politician. Both, no doubt, peopled it with creatures of their imagination. But when we have made due allowance for all their idealistic fantasies there still remains the hard core of fact, namely, that the legend of a lost country was common to all the European and North African civilizations and was found existing among the peoples of the South American continent. Such a universal belief cannot be dismissed lightly. Furthermore, the unbelieving scientists have not got it all their own way : geologists play with the notion, to put it no higher, of a lost Atlantis ; palaeontologists can bring proof of a race sufficiently civilized to have transmitted the tradition of a cataclysm that destroyed their country. There is plenty to be said for the theory and in this extremely interesting book Mr. Bramwell has collected the evidence and brought it up to date by including all the recent discoveries, hypotheses and guesses. I am not going to be tempted to a judgement on the evidence adduced, for I have not the scientific equipment to make such an opinion of any value. But I can testify to the absorbing interest of this book, although it is handicapped by a poor start (Mr. Bramwell devotes some introductory pages to a rather heavy facetiousness) and its end is marred, in my opinion, by some "spooky" stories intended to prove the existence of a folk-consciousness.

S. J. G.

Correspondent in Spain. By Edward H. Knoblaugh. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.)

In Franco's Spain. By Francis McCullagh. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 12s. 6d. net.)

THE old palmy days of the war correspondent are long over, and both of these books pay off old scores against the censorship of the Republican and Nationalist authorities respectively ; it must be confessed that neither adds much to our knowledge and illumination about the civil war.

Mr. Knoblaugh was in Spain for two or three years before it began, missed the actual outbreak, but covered Madrid and Valencia for eight months from August onwards, until he was expelled for his restiveness under the censorship. He seems to be a typical American reporter of the "Oh-boy-what-a-story !" kind ; one feels that he is describing with reasonable accuracy some of the

surface facts that came under his notice, but that he has very little real idea what it is all about. There are some grim first-hand impressions of the nightly unofficial "executions" in the Madrid suburbs early on; there is an interesting interview with Gil Robles in May 1936 (the subject discussed was the best time for Mr. Knoblaugh's summer holiday), and another during the war with Señor Prieto, who is reported as saying that, "Whoever wins will get nothing but the honour of winning . . . will inherit only a pile of ruins and the responsibility of salvaging a bankrupt nation. It will take at least twenty-five years for Spain to get back to normal."

The one thing certain about Mr. Knoblaugh is that his experience has turned his sympathies entirely against the Government. If there was anything at all on that side that made a favourable impression on him it finds no mention in his book, not even to the extent of a single sentence.

Captain McCullagh, being an old hand amongst wars and rumours of wars, made a rather impractical attempt, starting from Lisbon, to see the civil war as a free-lance journalist, with no particular credentials beyond a British passport. He was not able to see much of the war, but his voluble chapters, sardonic and rhetorical by turn, give a readable account of life behind the front, of the peasant volunteers' crusading enthusiasm in the first weeks, and a fleeting picture of the last and the unluckiest of the many Irish Brigades that march across the battlefields of history. He deplores the "growing deterioration of warfare" on this planet, and at the age of 63 places on record his determination to give up war-corresponding.

Captain McCullagh himself mentions his own reporting of Italian severities in the long-ago campaign in Tripoli, but it does not seem to occur to him that this might possibly have something to do with the chilly welcome he found in Burgos and Salamanca.

F. H. D.

The Letters of Tsar Nicholas and Empress Marie. Edited by Edward J. Bing. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson. 15s. net)

THIS correspondence between Nicholas II and his mother is a valuable corollary to that of the Tsar and his consort, and sheds a new light upon his complex character. The selection starts with letters written in 1879 by a boy of eleven, and ends by the mother's poignant missive from the Crimea, where, in 1917, she and her family were virtually held prisoners, to her dethroned son exiled to Siberia, a few months before his violent death. In the early letters we are allowed a glimpse behind the scenes, so to say, into

the family life ; strong ties of love unite the family, but the untimely death in 1894 of the father, Alexander III, a pillar of strength, marks the end of Nicholas's happy youth.

The heavy burden of autocracy over a country seething with discontent descends upon young and weak shoulders. Henceforth the tone of the letters changes ; Nicholas is still the dutiful and affectionate son, but gradually the mother recedes to a secondary place, for the wife, married in 1894, now holds all his love, and her influence, fatal for her husband and for Russia, grows steadily until it supersedes every other, even the Tsar's own, judgement. One letter, written as early as 1895, is curious—in it Nicholas with unexpected firmness refuses a request, supporting this refusal by much sound and reasoned argument. In the sphere of politics he tries to pursue the course he imagines would have been his father's, and when the empress censures the short-sighted policy of an arbitrary russification of Finland, an erstwhile peaceful and loyal country, the Tsar puts up a spirited defence of his policy. These letters upon Finland are significant, for they bear upon Russia's crucial problem : a composite state, comprising many different nationalities, she had either to pursue the nationalist ideal of the "Third Rome" consistently and ruthlessly or become a federation.

The letters of the last years, still cordial and affectionate, lack the warm spontaneity of the first : the Tsar is less willing to discuss his policy with his mother and harken to her opinion. The war, for which Russia was unprepared, became a sequence of short-lived successes followed by overwhelming disasters culminating in the revolution. The dethroned monarch, betrayed and abandoned by all, still lingered at H.Q., and his mother alone visited him there—their last meeting upon earth. For reasons insufficiently and unsatisfactorily explained, Kerensky transferred Nicholas and his family to Tobolsk—the rest of the tragedy is well known.

It is curious that the Soviet government should have released these letters, so complete a vindication of its victims, which leave the reader with a strong feeling of sympathy for two very lovable personalities whose tragic fate it was to live through such tremendous happenings. The translation is well done, and Mr. Bruce Lockhart's preface is all that could be expected ; but the editing is very defective owing to the editor's ignorance of the times and circles he deals with—there are many minor and not a few grave mistakes : a second edition would gain much by a thorough revision. The selection of photographs is haphazard and ill-chosen.

O. BENNIGSEN.

Work and Property. By Eric Gill. (Dent. 7s. 6d. net.)

MANY people who have strong convictions which they feel bound to put across in speech or writing are afraid of repeating themselves, or else they repeat themselves in such fashion as to be tiresome. Mr. Eric Gill makes neither mistake, and in these eight essays says over again, often more than once, sometimes in the same words, all those things which he has said before about man and art and industrialism and religion, and he does it so superlatively well that the sympathetic reader is more deeply convinced rather than, in contrariousness, antagonized. Only in the essay which gives the book its title does Mr. Gill break new ground (though it is implicit in all he has written before), and gives a masterly analysis of the *ratio* of man's right to private property.

Fr. Victor White, O.P., in reviewing this book, declared that the views expressed therein—which most people regard as strange and cranky—are “sheer Catholic truth”. To that verdict the writer of this review would like to add that, whereas Mr. Gill stresses the holiness of human work, his own writing is an example of that holiness—if only we had ears to hear.

Work and Property has twelve pictures by Denis Tegetmeier, who formerly enlivened the *Catholic Herald* every week (have you seen his *Seven Deadly Virtues*, published by Lovat Dickson?): the man singing “Adelaide” in a pub and the vicious jab at the clothes we wear and the knighted artists are Teg at his best.

L. E.

An Introduction to Symbolic Logic. By Susanne K. Langer. (George Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d. net.)

To those who start from “the state of perfect innocence”, as Dr. Langer calls the condition of the newcomer to symbolic logic, it may appear to be to traditional logic what a printed monomark is to your handwritten name and address; they may wonder, furthermore, whether it may not economize human meaning as well as ink. But the comparison cannot last if it suggests that the mathematical notation of the one is poorer, though more precise, than the dragging language of the other. For the new logic attempts to handle with accuracy and ease forms more complicated in structure than ever were envisaged by the old, and considers the categorical syllogism only as a fragment of the calculus of classes and the disjunctive and hypothetical syllogisms as contained in the calculus of elementary propositions.

The decline of rhetoric among the wise, the increasing recognition of complex functions, the feeling that mathematics is “the apotheosis of reason”, these have helped to produce this relatively

new subject, which, we are warned, is a technique as well as a theory, and cannot be learnt by contemplation. Accordingly this text-book provides exercises to teach dexterity. As a treatise it may be recommended for its clear and agreeable style, and for its method of working from the level of common sense to the stage where the student is prepared to follow the two classic developments of symbolic logic, the Boole-Schroeder algebra and the Whitehead-Russell logistics.

THOMAS GILBY, O.P.

La Mariologie de Saint Jean Damascène. By C. Chevalier, S.J.
(Orientalia Christiana Analecta, n. 109.)

AFTER a general and historical introduction of thirty-nine pages, the author treats of his subject under four main headings: the eternal life of the Virgin, the terrestrial life, divine motherhood, and after-life, followed by a final part treating of our Lady's power of intercession and her cult in the Church. The division is very clear but in fact does not convey any idea of what subjects may be discussed under each particular heading. So, for instance, Mary's part in Redemption is treated of in the chapter on "After-life". On the whole it is almost impossible to give a simple and straightforward criticism of the book; it is a real medley of clarity, penetration, unreliability, irrelevancy, of strenuous effort linked to an easy-going responsibility, of very close arguments which are not to the point. The best part seems to us the *idea* of accompanying a few truly important texts with a rather exhaustive running commentary. (p. 95-120).

We are afraid that if the book was given the *Prix du concours international de l'Institut catholique de Paris* it was without asking the advice of F. Victor Grumel, who in the *Echos d'Orient* (1937 p. 318-346) gave a thorough but justified and not unkind criticism of the work.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

Orbis Catholicus. Edited by Donald Attwater. 7s. 6d. net.
The Catholic Directory. 3s. 6d. net. *The Catholic Who's Who.*
6s. net. (Burns Oates & Washbourne.)

To their regular reference-books Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne have this year added *Orbis Catholicus*, which seeks to meet the long-standing need of an English equivalent to such books as the *Annuario Pontificio* and the *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique*; a former attempt, under the same title, came to an untimely end

with the second issue in 1918. The editor calls the new "Orbis" "a first draft for such an annual", and it is a very promising one; its main feature is a catalogue of the territorial divisions of the Catholic Church throughout the world, so arranged that the ecclesiastical organization of any country can be seen in some detail at a glance: other matters included are a list, with identifications, of the chief titular sees, particulars of the principal religious institutes, for men and women, Western and Eastern, Roman information, and indexes of all the bishops, vicars apostolic, etc., of the world.

It is proposed at present to bring *Orbis Catholicus* down to date annually by reprinting these indexes corrected and providing *corrigenda* for the rest. We hope that this carefully arranged and most useful book will be so successful that it can soon be enlarged and reprinted *in toto* every year. We hope, too, that the Catholic press will make use of it and so avoid some of the errors that are sometimes perpetrated (e.g., the Saint-Bernard "monks").

The Catholic Directory for 1938 maintains its standard—and no greater praise can be given it. It is the best-edited publication of its kind that we know. This reviewer is sorry, however, that it admits the advertisement of a foreign church-furnisher (with a picture of a bad and unrubrical altar). Are not our own stone and wood and workmen good enough?

The introduction to the 1938 *Who's Who* is written by Mr. Shane Leslie, who draws attention to the amount of unexpected and interesting detail to be found in this book, and very properly; but we would add that there is other detail that is unnecessary—some of the notices are garrulous and tiresomely "intimate", and others seem to have no connection at all with the British Isles or Dominions. However, that does not affect the great value of the book for the journalist and the "chariteer" (Mr. Leslie's word).

L. E.

The Catholic Doctor. By Fr. Alphonsus Bonnar, O.F.M., D.D.
(Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d. net.)

So admirable is this book that criticism can be but appreciation and recommendation. It is true in this case that "no Catholic doctor should be without it"—and no priest either. By a marvellous capacity for condensation the author has compressed into 170 pages a veritable encyclopedia: abortion, birth-prevention, sterilization, euthanasia, are of course dealt with, but in addition there is a brilliant summary of the essentials of Catholic dogma and teaching, so that we start with a rock-bottom basis for all subsequent discussion.

In respect of the subjects with which the reviewer is most familiar—namely, mental defect and psychotherapy—there is hardly a line which one could alter. In dealing with the former, Fr. Alphonsus has obviously gone to great trouble to digest the contents of the Brock Report, and has given all the necessary facts and figures with the most absolute impartiality before passing on to a destructive criticism of sterilization. As very few practitioners would pretend to have the time, patience, or knowledge necessary to do this, they should procure the book if only for this section; moreover, every intelligent layman should be able to argue on this and kindred subjects, so that we are left with the need for every adult educated Catholic to own or at least have access to the book.

As for that subject of topical and, indeed, vital interest, psychotherapy, and especially psycho-analysis, we do not recall any summary so fair and so clear, or any criticism so just, from a Catholic pen.

Fr. Alphonsus is the first to admit the help he has received from experts, but the credit due to himself is great, and one Catholic doctor will be echoing many others in thanking him most warmly and enthusiastically.

C. L. C. B.

Realization. By Hugh McCarron, S.J. (Sheed & Ward. 5s. net.)

THIS little book, like a large number of recent works by Catholics on aesthetics, appears to derive from Maritain's *Art and Scholasticism*, which itself expounded principles implicit in the Thomistic system.

Thus Maritain emphasizes the distinction between the *gaudium* which springs from the intuition of the beautiful and the various "emotions" which are the accidental accompaniments of that joy. Now poetry often has "emotions" for its explicit subject matter. But Father McCarron, in a chapter on "If Poetry is Indeed to See Rather Than to Feel Various Emotions", suggests that the distinction still holds good.

"I do not want to fatten a slim book," he says at the beginning. In this, probably, lies the book's chief defect. We do not, it is true, want "a digest of Preraphaelitism, the Imagists' creed, Symbolism, or even of Hephaestion's handbook of metre", but this essay relies too much on suggestiveness rather than explicitness. It is in itself a sort of poetry. And even if ultimately all definition resolves into intuition an author who aims at exactitude should by discursive elaboration try to ensure that his own and his reader's intuitions are of the same thing. This, of course, would have meant a far larger book.

Thus the "main thought of the book" is an answer to the query, "If the Joyful Poetic Contemplation be Rooted in the Interrelation of Things". But the notion of "relation" is not sufficiently analysed before application to the thesis.

There appears this difficult statement on p. 57 about the poetry of the Metaphysicals and Pseudo-Classicals: "When idea and picture are simultaneously present in the work of either class, we unhesitatingly call the work poetry; if both are not present, we are perplexed and are forced to elaborate defence." It is contrary to experience and to scholastic doctrine that universal concepts and sensible particulars can be dissociated, even though the association is accidental. Father McCarron should have been more explicit here.

This book is the valuable germ of a far larger work which the author should write.

ERNEST MOSS.

The Herne's Egg. By W. B. Yeats. (Macmillan. 5s. net.)

Alcazar. By Egerton Clarke. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 1s.)

The Silver Branch. An anthology of Irish poetry selected by Seán O'Faoláin. (Cape. 5s. net.)

The Herne's Egg, a stage play, will not add to Mr. Yeats's reputation. The myth of the Great Herne, a sort of divine bird, is extremely obscure, and Mr. Yeats has extracted out of it just those elements that most needed transmutation and has rejected just those which lead to nobler interpretations. The amours of a superheron are neither edifying nor amusing, and Mr. Yeats has made a mess of the whole affair because he has lost sight of the essential nature of the symbol. The true symbol must always stand for a mysterious reality greater than itself. But here the bird always remains a bird and the human "characters" have not even the natural dignity of animals. The poetry both in its content and in its rhythm is much below the standard of Mr. Yeats at his best.

In *Alcazar* Mr. Clarke has produced a volume of poems of value and interest and materially increased his reputation as a writer of poetry. His interpretation of history in the title-poem, in which the communist assault on Christendom is regarded as the final working out of the schism of Byzantium from Rome, is made convincing and the result is a piece of the school of "Lepanto". But there are finer and more individual poems. "Cistercians in the Mangold Field" has great power, and there is an apocalyptic beauty in "*Munera Angelorum*". But the finest piece is "The

Wounds of the Birds", a poem, I believe, destined to take a place among the classic religious poems of English literature.

Neither in the Dark nor the Middle Ages does the Irish Church appear to have produced much religious poetry. There is nothing, as Mr. O'Faoláin points out in his introduction to *The Silver Branch*, to compare with the Franciscan poetry of Italy. But the anthology includes a handful of religious lyrics of great beauty, and mingled faintly with this white innocence of Christendom comes the sound of the harps of faery and the sorrow of Deirdre weeping over the body of Naoisi, singer, lover, and warrior.

W. R. C.

Intercessions. By Denis Devlin. (The Europa Press. 3s. 6d. net.)

It would be inaccurate and misleading to call this book surrealist, but without at least a mention of the word we should be unaware of the backcloth against which the author speaks. The book is one of the Europa Poets, a list including works by Paul Eluard, with illustrations by Picasso, and George Reavey. In that list the present author is not out of place. The costumes and settings are what we have been led to expect: obscure symbolism, recondite allusion, flashes of breathless realism.

"Blood's aromatic in my breath, a respite
The wind may unwax my summer, let the
Accountant suspend work, wipe his misty glasses
The wind pads almost noiseless like a cat
Do not reject its sauve caress, Heart."

But there is not the slightest suggestion of "a piece by heart". He wears his assumed garments easily and not too seriously. He has individual power which gives him liberty to be critical and not enslaved. Indeed, the poems show how creative ability can nullify not only what is false in theory but also what is a hindrance in practice.

These tricks, which can, and have often been, a cloak for wordy emptiness, can also be a genuine striving to express what has been called "the talk of the angels". In these poems, especially in the longer ones, they combine to keep the eye and the ear and the mind expectant. They give one the satisfying feeling that the author has a great deal to say, and, here and there, the attention is made to linger while it savours more fully the telling word and phrase.

M. B.

Isle of Destiny. By James Devane. (Browne & Nolan. 3s. 6d.)

IF the author of this treatise had been content to use in it a less rhetorical style than he there employs it is possible that his leaves had produced a more definite and enduring effect than is unfortunately the case. But as it is, his rhapsodical manner and somewhat hectic mode of speech tend to obscure the issues which he has raised, and, generally, to fatigue the reader.

Ireland, as forming a part of the Celtic world, is in some sort no doubt an isle of destiny; but then Ireland is not by any means the whole Celtic world, and Dr. Devane's apparent failure to grasp this elementary but essential political and cultural fact takes off a good deal from the value and interest of his different speculations. In fine, Ireland's destiny is too plainly and closely bound up with that of the rest of the Celtic world to justify this written attempt to treat of her and her fortunes as though both were entirely independent of the other. Again, some of Dr. Devane's assertions make very dubious history. For instance, "in Scotland the Reformation was a popular movement", he says; whereas the truth is that in Scotland (as in France) the movement spoken of was aristocratic by origin, and had for long but slender support among the community. It showed precisely the same tendency in Ireland; but there—most fortunately—circumstances conspired to isolate the disruptive action of the gentry. This book touches but the fringe of a very large and important topic.

RUARAIÐH ERSKINE OF MARR.

THE CRITERION

A QUARTERLY REVIEW

EDITED BY T. S. ELIOT

Vol. XVII

Number LXVIII

Contents—April, 1938

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF CHINESE

POETRY	HSIEH WEN TUNG
THE VETERANS	DONAGH MACDONAGH
GRAY AND MATTHEW ARNOLD	R. C. CHURCHILL
FROM FIVE TILL SIX	JAMES HANLEY
POEMS	K. J. RAINE
MARX AND PROUDHON	MONTGOMERY BUTCHART
BABINGTON	A. A. LE M. SIMPSON
THY KINGDOM COME	MONTGOMERY BELGION
IN TIME OF SICKNESS	G. ROSTREVOR HAMILTON

A COMMENTARY

MUSIC CHRONICLE	PHILIP F. RADCLIFFE
BROADCASTING CHRONICLE	GEOFFREY TANDY
FICTION CHRONICLE	A. DESMOND HAWKINS

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER:

<i>Georgian Adventure</i>	MAURICE B. RECKITT
<i>Ends and Means</i>	F. McEACHRAN
<i>Recent Verse</i>	JANET ADAM SMITH
<i>The Place of St. Thomas More</i>	CHARLES SMYTH
<i>What Man has Made of Man</i>	PHILIP MAIRET
<i>Mr. Yeats's Vision</i>	STEPHEN SPENDER
<i>St. John of the Cross</i>	M. C. D'ARCY
<i>Two Shakespeare Books</i>	BERNARD BLACKSTONE
<i>Miss Stebbing and the Physicists</i>	MICHAEL ROBERTS
<i>Central Polynesians</i>	CHARLES MADGE
<i>Mr. Santayana's Truth</i>	DANIEL CORY
<i>The Modernists</i>	GEORGE EVERY
<i>Science and Common Sense</i>	GEOFFREY TANDY
<i>Verse Translations</i>	BASIL BUNTING
<i>Poetry and Contemplation</i>	RICHARD CHURCH
<i>Some Art Books</i>	H. GORDON PORTEUS
<i>La Philosophie Chrétienne</i>	NIGEL ABERCROMBIE
<i>Seventeenth Century Studies</i>	BONAMY DOBRÉE
<i>John Bunyan</i>	ASHLEY SAMPSON
<i>Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns</i>	L. C. KNIGHTS
<i>Mr. Beaumont on the Ballet</i>	ZENKA BARTKE
<i>Totemica</i>	A. L. MORTON
<i>Quia Amore Languo</i>	GEORGE BARKER

SHORTER NOTICES

PERIODICALS

Published by

30s. per annum

FABER & FABER, LIMITED

24 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

